Check for updates

Ghosts from the past: India's undead languages

Andrew Ollett

Columbia University, New York

What is Paiśācī and how does it fit into a larger history of language and literature in pre-modern India? A re-examination of the sources suggests three points: first, that when people first started talking about Paiśācī in the mid-first millennium CE*, it was not thought to be a language in the same sense that Sanskrit and Prakrit were languages; second, that Paiśācī was integrated into Indian classifications of language at a later stage (ninth–tenth centuries), through the related influences of theatrical knowledge (*nāṭyaśāstra*) and Prakrit grammar; third, that the* Bṛhatkathā*—which has always been imagined to be ground zero for Paiśācī—was 'lost' not just in the weak sense (of a text that is no longer available at a certain time and place) but in a stronger sense (of a text that is fundamentally incompatible with the principles of textuality operative at a certain time and place). I conclude that the term Paiśācī is a playful reinterpretation of* bhūtabhāṣā*, 'the language of the past', and that the language is a relic of a textual culture that itself became a 'ghost' with the advent of the Sanskrit cosmopolis around the second century* CE*.*

Keywords: Paiśācī, *bhūtabhāṣā*, *Bṛhatkathā*, Guṇāḍhya, Prakrit

Introduction

If you collected all of the testimonia for Paiśācī—fragments embedded in texts on poetics, words cited by grammarians and passages included in stories like the *Kuvalayamālā* or the *Līlāvatīsāra*—you might be able to fit it all onto a single printed page.[1] Yet 'the mysterious Paiśācī' has generated a large volume of scholarship in proportion to the amount of text that survives.[2] It certainly offers ample ground for speculation: the very name means 'language of the ghosts' (or ghouls, or demons or whatever other nasty supernatural creatures we might understand by the word *piśāca*), and notices of the language in pre-modern sources are brief, exiguous and contradictory. Pollock called it 'the joker in the deck of South Asian discourses on language'.[3]

[1] I have attempted to collect all of the Paiśācī fragments in an appendix to this article, which is (including notes and translations) only a few pages. I am grateful to the participants in the 5th International Indology Graduate Research Symposium in Bochum (in October 2013), where some of these arguments were presented, to Whitney Cox and Sheldon Pollock for comments on an earlier version of this article, and to Daniele Cuneo for suggesting the title.

[2] 'Mysterious Paiśācī': Keith, *History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 28.

[3] Pollock, *Language of the Gods*, p. 92.

***The Indian Economic and Social History Review*, 51, 4 (2014): 405–456**
SAGE Los Angeles/London/New Delhi/Singapore/Washington DC
DOI: 10.1177/0019464614550761

What I wish to do in this article is not to simply add my own speculation to the record, but critically assess the presuppositions that have guided research on Paiśācī. If we continue to think about Paiśācī in more or less the same way that George Grierson did a century ago, we miss the opportunity to ask really interesting questions about the history of a literary tradition, and instead saddle ourselves with speculative and fundamentally unanswerable questions about the linguistic geography of India—namely, where the 'homeland' of Paiśācī was and who its speakers were. Thus I begin with an investigation of the basic questions and approaches that have guided scholarship on Paiśācī in the past. From there, I re-examine the sources to develop a clearer picture of what this language actually meant to the authors who actually talk about it. Three main points emerge from this discussion: first, that when people first started talking about Paiśācī in the mid-first millennium CE, it was not thought to be a language in the same sense that Sanskrit and Prakrit were languages; second, that Paiśācī was integrated into Indian classifications of language at a *later* stage, around the ninth and tenth centuries, through the related influences of theatrical knowledge (*nāṭyaśāstra*) and Prakrit grammar; third, that the *Bṛhatkathā*—which has always been imagined to be ground zero for Paiśācī—was 'lost' not just in the weak sense (of a text that is no longer available at a certain time and place) but in a stronger sense (of a text that is fundamentally incompatible with the principles of textuality operative at a certain time and place). I conclude with some conjectures about the prehistory of Paiśācī, that is, what it might have been in the period *before* it enters the record of extant literary and epigraphic texts, and what position it might have had in the literary and linguistic history of India. I argue that the term Paiśācī is a playful reinterpretation of *bhūtabhāṣā*, 'the language of the past', and it is in fact a relic of a textual culture that itself became a 'ghost' with the advent of the Sanskrit cosmopolis around the second century CE.

A History of Scholarship on Paiśācī

The earliest notice of Paiśācī in European scholarship appeared in the path-breaking *Institutiones linguae pracriticae* of Christian Lassen in 1837. Pischel had included some remarks on Paiśācī in his magisterial *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*, published in 1900. In the same decade, there appeared two works that brought Paiśācī to the forefront of scholarly discussion. These two works represented two very different approaches to the problem: I will call them the 'ethnographic' approach and the 'literary–historical' approach.

The Ethnographic Approach

The first was George Grierson's book, *The Piśāca Languages of North-Western India* (1906). Grierson's primary task was a description of the spoken languages of the northwest, which are now generally called the Nuristani and Dardic languages.

His secondary task was a demonstration of the genetic relationship between these languages and Paiśācī as described by premodern grammarians. This demonstration was important to Grierson because it allowed him to localise Paiśācī in space and time: he felt he had tied the wispy strands of Paiśācī to a *real* language with *real* speakers in a *real* place. In fact, Grierson's argument proceeds from an earlier suggestion of Pischel, who noted in his grammar that 'the home of P[aiśācī] has to be searched for in the northwest in India'.[4] Pischel's statement was based on the observation that the languages of the northwest sometimes have voiceless aspirates where other Indo-Aryan languages have voiced aspirates, which accords with some of the descriptions of Paiśācī in the Prakrit grammarians. Grierson added other correspondences in his 1906 book.[5] In an article of 1912—which was primarily a response to an article by Sten Konow—Grierson reiterated his position with further arguments. The crucial manoeuvre occurs in a section titled 'Who were the Piśācas?': there, Grierson admitted that *piśāca* most commonly refers to a *mythological* being, a 'ghoul', but immediately suggested that the word actually designated 'human beings obnoxious to the authors of the passages in which their names occur'.[6] Like Rākṣasas and Asuras, Grierson argued, Piśācas were *real* people whom the 'Aryan' authors of Sanskrit texts *represented* as demonic ghouls: today we might call this a strategy of othering.[7] Grierson then referred to more than a dozen passages from the *Mahābhārata* to support his contention that 'Piśāca' was a 'generic, opprobrious, nickname for the unorthodox tribes, Aryan and non-Aryan… of North-Western India and the neighboring mountains'.[8] Grierson misunderstood a few passages in the Prakrit grammarians regarding Paiśācī, but his larger argument has proven quite influential.[9]

Grierson undertook his study of Paiśācī while he was overseeing the massive *Linguistic Survey of India*, and there is a close connection between the projects: his philological work gave a historical dimension to the languages that he documented for the *Survey*, and the data from the *Survey* supplied the ethnographic details that were often missing from premodern texts. It would not be too unfair to Grierson

[4] Pischel, *Grammar*, p. 30.

[5] Grierson's linguistic argument—which I will not discuss in detail here—has been greatly undermined by the discovery of early texts that are actually composed in the vernacular language of northwest India. This language, Gāndhārī, has no immediately discernible kinship with Paiśācī in particular, although it shares with Paiśācī many features of Middle Indic in general. For more on Gāndhārī, see Salomon, *Ancient Buddhist Scrolls from Gandhāra*.

[6] Grierson, 'Paiśācī, Piśācas, and "Modern Piśāca"', p. 68.

[7] Compare what Pollock in 'Rāmāyaṇa and Political Imagination' (p. 273) has called 'rākṣasization': the representation of Turkic peoples from western and central Asia as demons in Sanskrit texts, and especially the 'piśācisation' of the same Turkic peoples in twelfth century Sanskrit plays, discussed below (n. 52).

[8] Grierson, 'Paiśācī, Piśācas, and "Modern Piśāca"', p. 69.

[9] See Aiyavaraguna, 'Paiśācī Prakrit' and Ramanujaswami, 'Hemacandra and Paiśācī Prakrit' for corrections to Grierson.

to say that he read the Prakrit grammarians as if they were proleptic responses to the *Survey*. His work embodies an 'ethnographic' approach to Paiśācī. Its operating assumption was that 'Paiśācī' was a real language, namely, the spoken vernacular of the 'Piśāca' people; its goals were to identify who these 'Piśāca' people were and where they lived; its methods were the reconstruction of a 'historical' Paiśācī language and its genealogical linkage with one or more 'modern' languages. What makes this approach 'ethnographic' is that its ultimate objects are not literary traditions or even languages, but *peoples*: discrete communities with their own distinctive customs and language and history. This is why the vernacular, or 'mother language', is so important: it is the language that defines a people, passed down from generation to generation within kin groups; it contrasts with the 'learned' language that has little to no ethnographic value precisely because it is learned by many different communities. It therefore comes as no surprise that Grierson had to consider Paiśācī a 'vernacular' if he wanted to link it to the so-called Piśāca communities of north-western India.[10]

The Literary–Historical Approach

Félix Lacôte published his *Essai sur Guṇāḍhya et la Bṛhatkathā* in 1908. It was the first book to examine in detail the different recreations of the *Bṛhatkathā*, including one—the *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṅgraha* of Budhasvāmin—that was previously unknown. Lacôte's approach was 'literary–historical': he was interested in Paiśācī as the language in which the lost *Bṛhatkathā* had been composed, that is, as a *literary language*. Of course, Paiśācī's being a literary language does not necessarily close off the possibility that it was *also* a spoken language, or that the literary language was *based upon* a particular spoken language, and in fact Lacôte accepted most of Grierson's suggestions regarding its origins in a spoken language of the northwest. But despite this apparent agreement, Lacôte came to a much different understanding than Grierson of what Paiśācī actually was. It was a Prakrit, and according to Lacôte, 'les prâkrits, au sense étroit que donnent les grammariens à ce terme, n'ont pas de réalité linguistique, ou, plus exactement, ils n'en ont qu'une indirecte' (The Prakrits, in the strict sense which the grammarians give to this term, have no linguistic reality, or more precisely, they have only an indirect one).[11] For him it made as little sense to treat Paiśācī as a vernacular as it did to call a group of modern vernaculars 'modern Paiśācī'.[12]

Although Lacôte did not frame the question in exactly this way, his *Essai* posits a qualitative difference between Paiśācī as a literary Prakrit and Paiśācī as a spoken

[10] Grierson, 'Paiśācī, Piśācas, and "Modern Piśāca"', p. 86.

[11] Lacôte, *Essai*, p. 42.

[12] '[I]l y aurait abus à leur imposer (namely, on the modern languages of Nuristan and the Kashmir valley)… ce nom de Paiçācī qu'historiquement elles n'ont jamais porté' (It would be an abuse to impose on them... the name 'Paiśacī,' which historically they never had.) (Lacôte, *Essai*, p. 46).

vernacular, if indeed Paiśācī can be called a spoken vernacular at all: it is *only* as a literary Prakrit, he argued, that Paiśācī was ever recognised in premodern India.[13] Selecting a 'before' and 'after' moment might help to make this difference clear, even if it forces us to simplify things for the moment. Before the composition of the *Bṛhatkathā*, there perhaps was no Paiśācī, that is, no language that would be recognised by that name. There may well have existed some form of speech that was represented as or transformed into 'the language of the Piśācas' in the *Bṛhatkathā*, and we can ask all kinds of questions about this hypothetical form of speech: who its speakers were, where its homeland was, what its modern descendants are and so on. These are all Griersonian questions. But the composition of the *Bṛhatkathā* brought Paiśācī into existence as a literary language. About this language, we can ask an entirely different set of questions: who chose to write in it, what motivated this choice, what rules governed its use and so on. If we asked what the 'homeland' of this language was, the best answer might be the *Bṛhatkathā* itself. If Lacôte saw a close connection between Paiśācī and Kashmir, it was not the *genetic* relationship that Grierson posited between 'ancient' and 'modern' Paiśācī, but rather the long *tradition* of re-reading and re-writing the *Bṛhatkathā* in Kashmir. For Lacôte believed that Paiśācī was not only the language of the original *Bṛhatkathā*, but also the Kashmiri adaptation that served as the model for both Kṣemendra's *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* and Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara*.

Sten Konow combined both the 'ethnographic' and 'literary–historical' approaches, although like Lacôte he emphasised that *all* of the sources that describe Paiśācī describe it as a literary language, and like Lacôte he assumed a qualitative distinction between spoken vernaculars and literary languages.[14] Following an earlier suggestion of Hoernle, Konow suggested that Paiśācī represented a 'rewriting' of a Middle Indic language according to the phonology of a Dravidian substrate language, which he located in the vicinity of the Vindhya Mountains. Konow's most important contribution to the debate was the idea of a phonological or orthographic 'filter', which would take some mystery language—Sanskrit or Pali or some other Middle Indic language—as input and produce Paiśācī as output. Grierson attacked this idea on tendentious and quasi-racialist grounds,[15]

[13] With a few late exceptions: Lakṣmīdhara (mid-sixteenth century), and an anonymous grammarian cited by Mārkaṇḍeya (mid-sixteenth century), use 'Paiśācī' more or less in the sense of 'vernacular'.

[14] 'Where [Paiśācī] has been described in detail, it has been dealt with as a Prakrit, i.e. as a literary language and not as a spoken vernacular' (from 'The Home of Paiśācī', p. 98); '[d]as litteräre Prakrit ist meiner Überzeugung nach nie eine lebendige Sprache gewesen' (from a review of Bloch's *Vararuci und Hemacandra*, p. 478).

[15] I say 'tendentious' because Grierson appealed to his own idea that the Paiśācī vocabulary included loan-words from Sanskrit and Śaurasenī Prakrit, which is very problematic. Regarding 'quasi-racialist': 'If our authorities give a correct account of it, it was an independent language—a vernacular—not a mongrel form of speech used by savages brought into contact with Aryan civilization, and having another tongue of their own' ('Paiśācī, Piśācas, and "Modern Piśāca"', p. 86).

but it would remain a useful concept for relating the ethnographic and literary–historical approaches.

The next two milestones in the scholarship on Paiśācī (after a short outburst of the Grierson–Konow debate in 1921)[16] were a comprehensive survey of scholarship by A.N. Upadhye in 1939–40, and an article by Alfred Master in 1943. Disappointed with the *aporia*s of the previous generation, Master made a fresh study of all of the literary and epigraphic texts known to him which either mentioned or described Paiśācī (or what had until then been taken to be its synonyms: Paiśācika, Piśācabhāṣā, *bhūtabhāṣā*, etc.). His article is the best example of the literary–historical approach: Master sought first of all to understand *what* was known about Paiśācī in premodern India, and then to fit this knowledge into a coherent historical narrative. In this project he used texts that were either unknown to or ignored by Grierson, Lacôte and Konow, including several Kannada texts and the recently-discovered *Kuvalayamālā* of Uddyotanasūri, a novel in Prakrit prose with sections in Paiśācī that Master himself and F.B.J. Kuiper would later discuss at length.[17] Master also built upon the work of Luigia Nitti-Dolci, who edited an early 'eastern' grammar of Prakrit (the *Prākṛtānuśāsana* of Puruṣottama, early twelfth century) in 1938, and in the same year produced *Les grammariens prakrits*, which sought to elicit the complex historical relationships between the Prakrit grammarians rather than grouping them into unchanging 'schools'.[18] Upadhye gave a historical overview of the treatment of Paiśācī in the Prakrit grammarians, and in general his conclusions are similar to Nitti-Dolci's and Master's, although he silently rejects many of Nitti-Dolci's interventions.[19] In subsequent years, scholars noted a number of other passages that either discuss or exemplify Paiśācī, including in Jain *stotra*s and in Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*.[20]

I will briefly summarise Master's conclusions because they form the starting-point of the following discussion. First, Master emphasised the similarities

[16] Grierson, 'Rājaśekhara and the Home of Paiśācī'; Konow, 'Rājaśekhara on the Home of Paiśācī'. Also worth mentioning is Bagchi's attempt, in 'Sulika, Cūlikā, and Cūlikā-Paiśācī', to connect the word *cūlikā* (in the designation *cūlikāpaiśācika*) with the Sogdians. See p. 428.

[17] Master, 'An Unpublished Fragment of Paiśācī'; Kuiper, 'The Paiśācī Fragment of the Kuvalayamālā'.

[18] The notion of eastern and western 'schools' of Prakrit grammar is another legacy of George Grierson. It has been justly criticised in several places (for example, Upadhye 'Vālmīki-Sūtras, A Myth', p. 171), but dies hard.

[19] For example, Nitti-Dolci had proven that the Paiśācī chapter of Vararuci's *Prākṛtaprakāśa* belongs to a much later addition, and that Caṇḍa's *Prākṛtalakṣaṇa* is a much later text than its first editor, Hoernle, had thought. Elsewhere, Upadhye sharply criticized Nitti-Dolci's arguments about Hemacandra's sources and their relation to Trivikrama (see Upadhye, 'Vālmīki-Sūtras, A Myth').

[20] Schubring, 'Prakrit-Dichtung und Prakrit-Grammatik'; Raghavan, 'The Original Paiśācī Bṛhatkathā'. I mention Schubring's 1926 paper here because Master apparently took no notice of it. Maurice Bloomfield also presented a paper on Paiśācī verses in Ajitaprabhasūri's *Śāntināthacarita* at a meeting of the American Oriental Society in 1924 (p. 169 of that year's *Journal*, noted in von Hinüber, 'Die Paiśācī', n. 4).

between Paiśācī and Pali, which scholars had noted long before him.[21] He suggested that Paiśācī, in the original form represented by the lost *Bṛhatkathā*, was a 'perversion of Pali', although it is far from clear what that statement would mean. In several places, he hints that Paiśācī functioned more or less as a Śaiva or Bhāgavata—in any case non-Buddhist—equivalent of Pali. He also made an important point about Paiśācī in the tradition of Prakrit grammar: as time goes on, descriptions of Paiśācī become increasingly confused. The so-called 'dialects' of Paiśācī, which were so important for the Griersonian project, are nothing more than a way for Prakrit grammarians to reconcile what appeared to them to be contradictory sources about Paiśācī.[22] The growing confusion was due to the loss of the only Paiśācī text—again Master differs from both Grierson, who believed that the *Bṛhatkathā* was available to Mārkaṇḍeya in the sixteenth century,[23] and Lacôte, who believed that a Paiśācī adaptation of the *Bṛhatkathā* was available in Kashmir in the eleventh century—as well as to the name Paiśācī itself, which invited grammarians to make it seem as weird and otherworldly as possible.

Recent Contributions

I will conclude this review of scholarship by noting two arguments that together represent the *status quaestionis* on Paiśācī. In 1981, Oskar von Hinüber argued that the 'sound change' so characteristic of Paiśācī—the replacement of voiced stops by voiceless stops—was in fact an exclusively orthographic phenomenon. At the time that Paiśācī was committed to writing, most other Middle Indic dialects had undergone a lenition of single intervocalic consonants as follows:

Pre-lenition phonology	[t]		[d]		
orthography	*t*		*d*		
Post-lenition phonology	[t]	→	[d]	→	[ð]
orthography	*t*		*t*		*d*

The post-lenition orthography would use the signs *t* and *d* to represent [d] and [ð] respectively—that is, the sounds that had *once been* [t] and [d]. According to von Hinüber, some early writing systems, reflected in certain Gāndhārī texts and

[21] Barth, quoted by Grierson, 'The Eastern School of Prakrit Grammarians and Paiśācī Prakrit', p. 119. Lacôte rejected the connection.

[22] Master's example is *Siddhahemacandra* 8.4.307, which substitutes *t* for *d*, and 8.4.325, which substitutes voiceless for voiced sounds generally. The first appears in the section on Paiśācika, and the second in the section on Cūlikā-paiśācika, but they are both taken from other grammarians's rules on Paiśācī plain and simple (the first from Namisādhu or his source, and the second from Kramadīśvara or his source).

[23] Grierson, 'The Bṛhatkathā in Mārkaṇḍeya'.

in Khotanese Saka, exhibit this reassignment. Paiśācī, he claims, is an attempt to write a pre-lenition language in a post-lenition orthography: [t] and [d] would both have to be represented using *t*, which at the time had the value of [d]; Paiśācī did not employ *d* because it did not use the sound that this letter corresponded to at the time, namely [ð]. This argument has a resemblance to Konow's. In both cases, Paiśācī represents the output of some mystery language when it is run through a 'filter': Konow's filter was phonological, and von Hinüber's is orthographic.

Although von Hinüber remained agnostic about what that mystery language might be in 1981, he offered some discrete suggestions in 1985 while defending his earlier argument against Sani's criticism (*infra*). In his 1985 article he claims that, once the 'veil' of its orthography is removed, Paiśācī is almost identical with Pali. The association of the *Bṛhatkathā* with Kauśāmbī, the capital of its hero Udayana, suggested to von Hinüber that Paiśācī might have been the literary language of this area: thus Paiśācī and Pali take their place in his schema as eastern and western versions, respectively, of Buddhist Middle Indic. Moreover von Hinüber hypothesises that Paiśācī ultimately failed as a literary language because there were no patrons to promote the language in Kauśāmbī the way that the Sātavāhanas had promoted Prakrit.

In 1985, Sani criticised von Hinüber's argument on two main grounds. The first was that the orthographic explanation seriously misrepresents the phonology of Middle Indic: if /t/ is realised as [d] in between vowels, that does not mean that /t/ no longer exists in the language, but only that [d] is one of its allophones. Similarly for /d/ and its allophones [d] and [ð]. This, of course, does not *eliminate* von Hinüber's hypothesis that Paiśācī is a Middle Indic language that has [t] and [d], written in the orthography of an as-yet unattested Middle Indic language that has reserved the letter *d* for [ð] and uses *t* for both [t] and [d].[24] But, as this formulation shows, this hypothesis requires several assumptions about the relationship between phonemes, their allophones, and their orthographic representation—assumptions for which there is only very circumstantial evidence. Moreover, if Paiśācī's phonology was more or less like Śaurasenī's, or even Sanskrit's, why was it written in a completely different way? Von Hinüber suggested in his response that the difference depends on the circumstances under which the language was first committed to writing—for which, again, we have no independent evidence, at least in the case of Paiśācī.

Sani's second criticism is that von Hinüber treats Paiśācī as a 'real' language, when all of the literary evidence suggests that it is a made-up language for demons and other otherworldly creatures to speak in plays and stories. Sani suggests that its primary characteristic, the fortition of intervocalic stops, is an inversion of the development that occurs in other Prakrits, namely, the lenition of the same sounds;

[24] Stefan Baums points out to me that one of the orthographies for Gāndhārī writes the sound [ð] (reflecting an etymological [t] or [d] in intervocalic position) with a modified version of the sign for the sound [t].

this characteristic gets exaggerated in later texts, such as Hemacandra's grammar. Accordingly it is useless to ask about the 'homeland' of Paiśācī, or its 'position' within the Indo-Aryan languages, because it was

> 'un'invenzione letteraria che nasce dall'esasperazione di tendenze fonetiche che hanno pur tuttavia alla base delle forme originariamente reali come gli ipercorrettismi e che è stato creato appositamente con questa particolarità fonetica perché apparisse una lingua "contro natura," adatta a essere una lingua di demoni.[25]
>
> [A literary invention which is born from an exaggeration of phonetic tendencies that were nevertheless based on real forms that originally occurred as hypercorrections, and which was created specifically with this phonetic particularity because it appeared to be an 'unnatural' language, suited to be a language of demons].

My review of the scholarship so far might set us up to think of von Hinüber's approach as Griersonian and Sani's as Lacôtean, but there are important differences. Von Hinüber accepts that Paiśācī must be a literary language, and is less concerned with identifying its speakers than with situating it, linguistically and historically, within the field of other literary languages such as Sanskrit, Pali, Gāndhārī and Khotanese. Sani, for his part, minimises the role of the *Bṛhatkathā* in the creation and transmission of knowledge about Paiśācī, whereas for Lacôte, the *Bṛhatkathā* and Paiśācī were fundamentally coextensive. Nevertheless von Hinüber is clearly concerned with the 'before', namely the process of *creating* a new literary language by literising it ('Aufzeichnung'), while Sani is concerned with the 'after', namely the significance that Paiśācī had for the people who talked about it.

In what follows, I will try to connect the 'after' to a plausible 'before'. My project is more or less a continuation of Master's: what do the sources actually say about Paiśācī, what kind of history can we reconstruct for it, and how does this history fit—or not fit—into the literary and cultural history of India?

Reconstructing Paiśācī

One way to answer these questions is to determine Paiśācī's position in the wider language order—that is, in the ways in which people within a culture named, categorised, described and evaluated languages in relation to each other. I use the phrase 'language order' to suggest, rather modestly, a relatively stable imaginary. I do not intend to suggest that these structures are immutable, and I will defer for now the important question of power and hegemony in enforcing these orders. Here I discuss three kinds of evidence for Paiśācī's position in the language order of India: first, the explicit schematisation of language that we often find in texts on grammar and poetics; second, the much-discussed analysis of Paiśācī in Prakrit grammar; and finally, the much-neglected issue of translation.

[25] Sani, 'La Paiśācī', p. 204.

The 'Half-language'

When Daṇḍin or Bhāmaha says that language basically comes in three varieties, they are offering a schema. The three-fold schema is not exactly a descriptive generalisation over the available evidence, nor a normative template: it is a way of *bringing to order* a vast set of cultural practices. The three-fold schema encompasses the totality of textual production, in the sense that it defines one of textual production's essential parameters: language. A statement like Bhāmaha's—language is Sanskrit, Prakrit, or Apabhraṃśa—obviously does not provide a list of all the languages known to him, or even all of the languages in which literature might conceivably be written. It is something like Foucault's historical *a priori*: the conditions under which a particular cultural practice makes sense and *counts* as a cultural practice. For Bhāmaha, Sanskrit, Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa formed one set—not the only set, but insofar as language was concerned a complete one—of literature's conditions of possibility. They thereby also characterised the larger cosmopolitan culture of which literature formed an essential part: Sanskrit, Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa were not just literary languages but languages of culture-power.

One of Paiśācī's fundamental characteristics is that it exists *outside of* or *on the margins of* these schemas of language. What this position implies—and what several sources explicitly say—is that *Paiśācī is not really a language*. On a modern conception of 'language', this is a hard statement to understand. It has a grammar, a vocabulary and a corpus of texts, or at least we have good reasons for believing that it had all of these things in the past. It certainly *looks like* a language. But we are not operating with a modern conception of 'language'. Since I have already mentioned Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha, and since they are some of the earliest writers to mention Paiśācī at all, I shall first attend to their apparent exclusion of Paiśācī from the category of 'language'.

Bhāmaha offers a three-fold division of *kāvya* into Sanskrit, Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa.[26] Daṇḍin's division is similar, but includes a 'mixture' of languages.[27] There is no room for Paiśācī here. Ratnaśrījñāna, Daṇḍin's tenth-century commentator, notes that 'mixture' can involve any of the above languages as well as Paiśācī, but specifically calls Paiśācī an 'additional' (*adhikā*) language.[28] When Daṇḍin does in fact mention Paiśācī, a few verses later, it is clear that it forms an exception to a general rule. After noting the association of certain genres with certain languages—Sanskrit for *mahākāvya*s, and so on—he says that stories and related genres are composed in all languages, but especially in Sanskrit. The wondrous

[26] *saṃskṛtaṃ prākṛtam cānyad apabhraṃśa iti tridhā* (Bhāmaha, *Kāvyālaṅkāra* 1.16*cd*).

[27] *tad idaṃ vāṅmayaṃ bhūyaḥ saṃskṛtaṃ prākṛtaṃ tathā | apabhraṃśaś ca miśraṃ cety āhur āptāś caturvidham* || (Daṇḍin, *Kāvyādarśa* 1.32).

[28] *saṃskṛtaṃ śuddhaṃ, prākṛtaṃ śuddham, apabhraṃśaḥ śuddhaḥ, miśraṃ ca taiḥ paiśācikena cāśuddham, adhikā tu pṛthaguktā* (*Ratnaśrī* on *Kāvyādārśa* 1.32, ed.-āśuddhyadhikā).

Bṛhatkathā, *however*, is composed in *bhūtabhāṣā* (*bhūtabhāṣāmayīṃ*).[29] That 'however' is important because it suggests that this *bhūtabhāṣā* is not included within 'all languages'.[30] It should be noted that Daṇḍin does not use the word *piśācabhāṣā* or *paiśācī*, but *bhūtabhāṣā*, which admits of multiple interpretations (see p. 438).[31]

How can we possibly make sense of this simultaneous recognition and exclusion of *bhūtabhāṣā*? The answer comes from the well-known story of the *Bṛhatkathā* itself. Guṇāḍhya, one of the ministers of king Sātavāhana, made an unfortunate bet with his colleague Śarvavarman: 'If you can teach the king in six months, then I will give up Sanskrit, Prakrit, and the regional language, the three languages (*bhāṣātrayam*) available to men.'[32] When Śarvavarman acquired supernatural powers from Skanda and taught the king in just six months, Guṇāḍhya began his self-imposed exile from Sātavāhana's court. He lived in the forests of the Vindhyā mountains, practicing austerities in order to propitiate the goddess Vindhyāvāsinī. She instructed him to seek out Kāṇabhūti. Guṇāḍhya then fell in with a group of forest-dwelling Piśācas and learned their language. At the crucial moment when he meets Kāṇabhūti—the event that triggers his recollection of his past life—the human Guṇāḍhya is able to greet the Piśāca Kāṇabhūti in 'the fourth language, the language of the *bhūta*s'.[33]

This story belongs to one of the *Bṛhatkathā*'s eleventh-century retellings, but it provides a clear and compelling rationale for the marginal status of Paiśācī, which probably existed in the sources that these retellings were based on, and which in any case accords perfectly with Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha's seventh- and eighth-century classification. There are two schemas involved here. The first is the *bhāṣātraya*, the 'three languages' that symbolically represent the entirety of human culture. In this story, the representation of human culture is dominated by the court: the bet centres on a royal minister (Śarvavarman or Guṇāḍhya) teaching a king (Sātavāhana) a language of universally-acknowledged culture-power (Sanskrit). The second could be called a *bhāṣācatuṣka*, since it includes 'the fourth language'. But the point of the story is that this kind of structure is essentially malformed: Paiśācī is not like the others, since it is not a language of human culture, but the language

[29] *kathādiḥ sarvabhāṣābhiḥ saṃskṛtena ca paṭhyate | bhūtabhāṣāmayīṃ tv āhur adbhutārthā bṛhatkathā* || (Daṇḍin, *Kāvyādarśa* 1.38).

[30] Ratnaśrījñāna interprets the *tu* in a weaker sense (*arthāntaravivakṣāyām*), but notes that Daṇḍin has given no prior indication that this language exists, unlike the previously-mentioned 'three languages' (*bhāṣātrayam*). The reading *prāhur* removes the contrast.

[31] The commentator Yāmuna, for example, first glosses *bhūtabhāṣā* as *piśācabhāṣā*, and then explains it as 'the language of the different types of beings who exist in various places' (*nānādeśavāstavyavividhabhūtabhāṣā*).

[32] *śrutvaivaitad asaṃbhāvyaṃ tam avocam ahaṃ ruṣā | ṣaḍbhir māsais tvayā devaḥ śikṣitaś cet tato mayā || saṃskṛtaṃ prākṛtaṃ tadvad deśabhāṣā ca sarvadā | bhāṣātrayam idaṃ tyaktaṃ yan manuṣyeṣu saṃbhavet* || (Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* 1.6.147–48).

[33] *dṛṣṭvā tvāṃ svāgataṃ kṛtvā caturthyā bhūtabhāṣayā* (Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* 1.7.29).

of those who *ex hypothesi* lie outside of it. Nor are the Piśācas merely outside. If Sātavāhana represents courtly culture—remember that Sātavāhana is supernaturally endowed with knowledge of Sanskrit and becomes a famous patron of literature—the Piśācas, the forest-dwelling ghouls, represent the exact opposite. Thus 'fourth' does not mean the fourth in a series of self-similar items, but contrastively defines the preceding three items as a self-similar group, and at the same time cancels or negates it. Malamoud has devoted a study to such four-fold structures, which are pervasive in Indian thought, for example in the *caturvarga*, the *caturvarṇa*, and so on. We can say, adapting Malamoud's distinction, that Paiśācī is not a *caturtha*-type of 'fourth' (the fourth element in a linear series) but a *turīya*-type (which 'completes a series of three in a two-level type of numbering'), and this accords with the traditional (although etymologically incorrect) linkage between *turīya* and the sense of 'crossing beyond' (*tṝ*).[34]

Paiśācī's position vis-à-vis the languages of culture can be illustrated with another passage from the *Kuvalayamālā*, completed by the Jain monk Uddyotanasūri in 779 CE. Master and Kuiper have discussed a passage of it composed in Paiśācī—the longest text in Paiśācī available to us—but almost exclusively with a view to the constitution of the text and its linguistic features.[35] This passage actually occurs in a deeply embedded context: in the story of Dhanadeva, which is one of the stories that the monk Dharmanandana tells to the minister Vāsava, which is a story that the hero Kuvalayacandra hears from a monk in the forest, who turns out to be Dhanadeva himself at a remove of several lifetimes. The immediate context is that the merchant Dhanadeva—nicknamed Lobhadeva because of his greed—has been shipwrecked in a distant land, and after escaping cannibals and man-eating birds, he finally finds a quiet place in the forest to rest. He falls asleep under a tree, but immediately wakes up to the sound of Piśācas talking. The Piśācas are discussing which place is most beautiful: the candidates are the garden of the Vidyādharas, Mount Meru, Indra's heaven, Himalaya and the Heavenly Ganges. This passage takes us as far away as possible from human culture: Dhanadeva has left Jambudvīpa, which for our purposes is 'India', for distant Ratnadvīpa, and now finds himself in the jungle with a bunch of cannibals. It is there that he overhears the Piśācas—or is that all just a dream, as hinted by Dhanadeva's nap under the tree? The places that are mentioned in the Piśācas' conversation—the places that these Piśācas are said to frequent—are all mythical or semi-mythical.

Dhanadeva is so far outside human culture that when he first hears the Piśācas, all he can recognise is the 'faint sound of both harsh and soft words spoken with a trace of dialect'.[36] He tries to match the language with one of the three languages

[34] Malamoud, 'On the Rhetoric and Semantics of Puruṣārtha'. *turīya-* is in fact derived from the same base as *caturtha-* by reduction and loss of the first syllable (**k*^{w}*etur-* → **k*^{w}*tur-* → **tur-*).

[35] See pp. 70–72 (§§137–39) in the *Kuvalayamālā* (passage A in the appendix); Kuiper, 'The Paiśācī Fragment of the Kuvalayamālā'; Master, 'An Unpublished Fragment of Paiśācī'.

[36] *īsi-vibhāsijjaṃta-khara-mahura-suhumeṇaṃ sareṇa*. The translation is from Master, 'An Unpublished Fragment of Paiśācī', p. 663.

that he knows, which unsurprisingly maps exactly onto the *bhāṣātraya* of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin.[37] His first guess is Sanskrit, which is 'harsh like the heart of a wicked person, difficult to understand with its hundreds of horrible options for forming all of the different words, compounds, indeclinables, prefixes, case endings, and genders'.[38] His second guess is Prakrit, which is 'pleasant like the words of a good person, made up of the nectar that streams forth when great men churn the ocean of life that constantly surges with the waves of all learning, with compositions of various types that perfectly join their sounds and words together'.[39] His third guess is Apabhraṃśa, which is like 'a mountain stream that gushes with floodwaters from the downpours of the first springtime clouds, rolling and swelling with the steady and unsteady waves that are the words of Sanskrit and Prakrit both pure and combined, alluringly harsh and gentle like the words of a lover in playful anger'.[40] Uddyotanasūri not only outlines the *bhāṣātraya* here, but elaborates on its internal structure. Like many others, he viewed Sanskrit and Prakrit as the opposing terms that define this structure: the differences lay in grammatical complexity, difficulty, aural texture and the ethical qualities of its authors (in Uddyotana's case, the 'great men' who compose in Prakrit are Jains). Quite uniquely, he defines Apabhraṃśa as a kind of mixture of Sanskrit and Prakrit; it is the co-presence of these opposing qualities that gives Apabhraṃśa its particular charm. Within this schema there is, once again, no space for Paiśācī. Only when Dhanadeva eliminates the other possibilities does he decide that the language is Paiśācī, which he describes merely as 'the fourth language' (*caütthā bhāsā pesāyā*). Paiśācī does not get its own positive description because it does not *have* a positive description. The space it occupies is negative: it exists only where human culture, and the *bhāṣātraya* that symbolises it, does not.

This interpretation finds some corroboration in a similar incident in the fourth chapter of Jinaratna's *Līlāvatīsāra*, composed in 1285. After swindling the king of Śrāvastī with the 'emperor's new clothes' trick, the greedy merchant Dhana escapes to the wilderness, where he wanders around until he faints under a tree. When he comes to, he tries to take a drink at a nearby lake, but an elephant emerges and chases him up a tree, where he falls asleep again. During the night he hears a group of Piśācas chattering, in Paiśācī, about the recent events in Śrāvastī. The episode

[37] The *bhāṣātraya* figures elsewhere in the Kuvalayamālā, for example, in the court of Dṛḍhavarman (p. 16, §40). See Upadhye's useful note in his introduction (p. 77) regarding the languages used in the text.

[38] *… taṃ aṇeya-paya-samāsa-ṇivāovasagga-vibhatti-liṃga-pariyappaṇā-kuviyappa-saya-duggamaṃ dujjaṇa-hiyayaṃ piva visamaṃ.*

[39] *… taṃ sayala-kalā-kalāva-mālā-jala-kallola-saṃkula-loya-vuttaṃta-mahoyahi-mahāpurisa-mahaṇuggayāmaya-ṇīsaṃda-biṃdu-saṃdohaṃ saṃgghaḍiya-ekkekkama-vaṇṇa-paya-ṇāṇārūva-virayaṇā-sahaṃ sajjaṇa-vayaṇaṃ piva suha-saṃgayaṃ* (ed. reads *saṃkulaṃ* for *saṃkula-*).

[40] *sakkaya-pāyaobhaya-suddhāsuddha-paya-sama-visama-taraṃga-raṃgata-vaggiraṃ ṇava-pāusa-jalaya-pavāha-pūra-pavvāliya-giri-ṇai-sarisaṃ sama-visamaṃ paṇaya-kuviya-piya-paṇaïṇī-samullāva-sarisaṃ maṇoharaṃ.*

is probably taken verbatim from Jinaratna's source, the lost *Nivvāṇalīlāvaīkahā* of Jineśvarasūri (composed in 1036).[41] It is clear that Jineśvara used the *Kuvalayamālā* as a model, although the kind of Paiśācī employed here is slightly different.[42] Once again, Piśācas and their language appear only in the wilderness, only at night and perhaps only in dreams or hallucinations.

My reading of these passages is admittedly structuralist. In attempting to understand one kind of structure, a 'language order', I map it onto other kinds of structure that are either more intelligible, or more fundamental, or both: namely, the categories of human culture. This is not the only possible reading of these passages, or even the most salient. Already Master had noted that the style of the Paiśācī section of the *Kuvalayamālā* is different from the lively and conversational style of the surrounding narrative: it is extremely imaginative and characterised by enormously long compounds. This suggested to Master that Uddyotana here intended to recreate the language and style of older 'Paiśācī' texts. If Master is correct—and I think he is—then Uddyotana is simultaneously alluding to, recontextualising and transforming these bits of Paiśācī in such a way that his readers encounter them as strange, fantastic and otherworldly.

To summarise: several early authors operated with a concept of the *bhāṣātraya*, which could be construed narrowly as the three languages in which *kāvya* could be composed (Daṇḍin), or broadly as the three kinds of languages current among human beings (Somadeva); the language of the ghosts, although sometimes described as a 'fourth' or 'additional' language, definitely fell outside of this concept; insofar as we associate language with human culture—especially courtly culture and literary culture—its very status as a 'language' is doubtful. As several tenth-century Kannada authors said: there are three and a half languages, and Paiśācī is the half.[43]

Later authors resolved these tensions by turning Paiśācī into a 'full' language. Rājaśekhara, who worked in central India around the turn of the tenth century, insistently promoted a vision of cosmopolitan culture that was defined by four languages: Sanskrit, Prakrit, Apabhraṃśa and Paiśācī. For example, in the prologue of his *Bālarāmāyaṇa*:

> The language of the gods is worth hearing, and the Prakrit languages are naturally sweet. Apabhraṃśa is very pleasant, and there are choice works in the language

[41] A hint that the episode was 'cut-and-pasted' from Jineśvara is that several phrases of narration, which ought to be in Sanskrit, are in Paiśācī (for example, 4.196*cd*); it seems likely that these phrases were originally in Prakrit and Jinaratna (or a later copyist) simply matched them to the Paiśācī of the quotations rather than to his own Sanskrit narration.

[42] Jinaratna's/Jineśvara's Paiśācī changes *r* to *l*, unlike Uddyotana's.

[43] Nāgavarman in his *Chandombudhi*: *saṃskṛtaṃ prākṛtam apabhraṃśaṃ paiśācikam emba mūṟuvare bhāṣegaḷoḷ*, Master, 'The Mysterious Paiśācī', pp. 43–44, and Pollock, *Language of the Gods*, p. 370; also Ponna in his *Śāntipurāṇa* (Master, *ibid*., p. 44).

of the ghosts. There are different paths, but these are the ones that are preferred. The one who writes in all of these is indeed a master poet.[44]

Vāgbhaṭa, who wrote during the reign of Jayasiṃha (1125–43), makes the 'language of the *bhūta*s' one of the four languages that constitute the 'body of literature' (*kāvyasya kāyatām*).[45]

Rājaśekhara and Vāgbhaṭa show us that, at a certain point, people started including Paiśācī in their classifications of language. What they do not give us is an explanation of this shift. One possibility is that it was a matter of personal preference whether and how Paiśācī was counted as a language, or more precisely, that Paiśācī's status depends on the vision of a language order to which one is already committed. This is a plausible enough explanation for Rājaśekhara, and for Vāgbhaṭa after him, because Rājaśekhara evidences a very spatial imagination of languages in his *Kāvyamīmāṃsā*. By this I mean that Rājaśekhara wants to represent languages in relation to each other in three-dimensional space; this is not just a personal idiosyncracy, but part of his project of theorising literary culture as cosmopolitan by mapping its practices onto an extensive and integrated cultural geography. I will cite just three examples, although many more can be found in the *Kāvyamīmāṃsā*. In the tenth chapter, Rājaśekhara maps each of the cosmopolitan languages onto one region of India where it is preferred. He places Paiśācī in Avantī, not because he considered this to be 'homeland' of Paiśācī or because there was a 'colony' of Paiśācī speakers in that area at the time, but probably because he had in mind Kālidāsa's verse linking the recitation of the *Bṛhatkathā* to Ujjayinī.[46] The Griersonian notion of a language that is specifically tied to a particular group of people who exist at a particular time and in a particular place is exactly opposite to the cosmopolitan vision that Rājaśekhara offers here: a literary language that can be and must be learned by any poet worthy of the name. The second example is Rājaśekhara's representation of Literature Man (*kāvyapuruṣa*) in the third chapter: Sanskrit forms his head, Prakrit his arms, Apabhraṃśa his hips and Paiśāca his legs. This is clearly a hierarchical schema of language practices, with Sanskrit on top and Paiśācī on the bottom, but one that unites all cosmopolitan languages into a single body and hence excludes the 'other paths' alluded to in the verse from the *Bālarāmāyaṇa*. Finally, Rājaśekhara's vision of the ideal court in the tenth chapter is quadrilateral and associates each of the four languages with one of

[44] *giraḥ śravyā divyāḥ prakṛtimadhurāḥ prākṛtadhurāḥ subhavyo 'pabhraṃśaḥ sarasaracanaṃ bhūtavacanam | vibhinnāḥ panthānaḥ kim api kamanīyāś ca ta ime nibaddhā yas tv eṣāṃ sa khalu nikhile 'smin kavivṛṣā* || (*Bālarāmāyaṇa* 1.10, cited in the introduction to the *Kāvyamīmāṃsā* p. XLIII).

[45] *saṃskṛtaṃ prākṛtaṃ tasyāpabhraṃśo bhūtabhāṣitam | iti bhāṣāś catasro 'pi yānti kāvyasya kāyatām* || (*Vāgbhaṭālaṅkāra* 2.1). For Vāgbhaṭa's date see Kane, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, pp. 286–87.

[46] Kālidāsa, *Meghadūta* 1.30 (*prāpyāvantīn udayanakathākovidagrāmavṛddhān*). The arguments of Konow ('Rājaśekhara on the Home of Paiśācī') and Grierson ('Rājaśekhara and the Home of Paiśācī') were already refuted by Master, 'The Mysterious Paiśācī', p. 35.

the four cardinal directions: Sanskrit poets in the north, Prakrit poets in the east, Apabhraṃśa poets in the west, and *bhūtabhāṣā* poets to the south.

From Half-language to Language

From the foregoing it might appear that Rājaśekhara's promotion of Paiśācī to a full language was motivated by reasons of symmetry. But we need to remember that Rājaśekhara's project is not merely taxonomic: it is not just the *names* and *number* of languages that is at stake, but the theorisation of a set of language practices that defined literary culture and related it to broader socio-political realities. Paiśācī's transformation from non- or half-language into language was a *real* transformation and it requires a *real* explanation. In this section I suggest that a double movement occurred towards the end of the first millennium. Around this time, Paiśācī became an object of grammatical analysis—an important step on the journey from speech to language—while the larger intellectual discourse of which grammar was a part increasingly oriented itself towards the theatre and the models of language use, and language choice, that it provided.[47] Thus Paiśācī, which was originally defined *in opposition to* Prakrit, came to be defined *as a sub-variety of* Prakrit. Once again, Master had noted this important process as early as 1943. Later scholars, however, have tended to see the rules for Paiśācī in Prakrit grammars either as faithful descriptions of real texts (von Hinüber) or as a completely new invention (Sani), but in any case without taking into account how Paiśācī was transformed by its incorporation into Prakrit grammar, or how Prakrit grammar was transformed by the incorporation of Paiśācī.

Rudraṭa in the ninth century was one of the first to include Paiśācī as a full-fledged language. He replaced the earlier schema of 'three languages' with a schema of 'six languages' (*ṣaḍbhāṣā*), namely Prakrit, Sanskrit, Māgadha, Piśācabhāṣā, Sūrasenī and Apabhraṃśa.[48] The schema of 'six languages', wherever Rudraṭa himself got it from, would become the most stable and enduring way of classifying languages in India, primarily through the influence of two authors who adopted it from Rudraṭa, Bhojadeva and Hemacandra. Three of the languages in this list were also represented in the earlier *bhāṣātraya*. Each of these three corresponded to a genre of cosmopolitan literature in which it was employed: Sanskrit for compositions like *mahākāvya*s, Prakrit for *skandhaka*s, and Apabhraṃśa for *osara*s.[49] Rudraṭa adds three more. Two of them, Māgadha and Sūrasenī, had been recognised

[47] See Pollock, *Language of the Gods*, pp. 415–16, for the role of grammar creating conceptually discrete languages out of speech continua.

[48] *prākṛta-saṃskṛta-māgadha-piśācabhāṣāś ca sūrasenī | ṣaṣṭho 'tra bhūribhedo désaviśeṣād apabhraṃśaḥ* || (Bhāmaha, *Kāvyālaṅkāra* 2.12). Cf. also Leclère, 'Ambivalent Representations of Muslims', p. 171: 'By mentioning Paiśācī between two dramatic Prakrits, Rudraṭa may have given rise to a confusion regarding both its nature and its use among the audience of the *Kāvyālaṃkāra*. It could have been taken as another category of Prakrit to be employed on the stage.'

[49] *Daṇḍin, Kāvyādarśa* 1.37.

by earlier authors as 'regional' varieties of Prakrit, but in this classification they are distinguished from both Prakrit and its other 'regional' varieties, such as Lāṭī, which Rudraṭa does not mention. And the final addition, Piśācabhāṣā, had earlier been excluded from classifications such as these, as we have seen.

Rudraṭa's reorganization of the *bhāṣātraya*—whether he effected it himself or found it in the work of a predecessor—can be explained by reference to two closely related developments: the growing influence of theater on the Sanskrit scholarship, and the emergence of multilingual Prakrit grammars. Both appear to have been in full swing in Kashmir of the ninth century, although I will not speculate about where they started and how they spread. It is well known that king Jayāpīḍa (r. 779–813) appointed Bhaṭṭa Udbhaṭa as *sabhāpati*—a director of the court's intellectuals—and that Bhaṭṭa Udbhaṭa initiated a long tradition of studying the *Nāṭyaśāstra* in Kashmir.[50] The study of this old text revitalised Sanskrit poetics with a new set of problematics. Crucially, it brought a set of *multilingual* forms to the forefront of analysis. Whereas Daṇḍin, Bhāmaha and Vāmana were largely concerned with *śravyakāvya*, where language generally did not vary within a single composition, later authors were increasingly concerned with *dṛśyakāvya*, where such variation was the rule. Abhinavagupta even singled out this difference as one of the respects in which *dṛśyakāvya* was superior to *śravyakāvya*.[51] Language thus was not just a parameter of variation *across* compositions, but a variable that could in fact be manipulated *within* a composition for particular reasons and with particular aesthetic effects. This is precisely how Bhoja frames his discussion of language-types (*jāti*) in his *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa*, to which we will return shortly.

The emergence of multilingual Prakrit grammars is more difficult to trace because the amount of surviving material is quite small and because no serious research on the history of Prakrit grammar has been done since the 1940s.[52] One assumption that could anchor this discourse in time and space is the identification of Bhāmaha, the author of the *Manoramā* commentary on Vararuci's *Prākṛtaprakāśa*, with the author of the *Kāvyālaṅkāra*, who lived in Kashmir around the end of the seventh century.[53] But nothing besides the name recommends the identification. It nevertheless appears that around the end of the first millennium there appeared a number of grammars that provided rules for several languages. While some of these grammars simply listed localised exceptions (such as Caṇḍa's), others provided discrete sets

[50] *Kalhaṇa, Rājataraṅgiṇī* 4.495.

[51] Pollock, 'From Rasa Seen to Rasa Heard', p. 190. Abhinavagupta of course did not mean that multilingual compositions were better *per se*, but that they offered a broader scope for the development of *rasa* insofar as they avoided certain improprieties (such as women speaking in Sanskrit) that are unavoidable in monolingual compositions.

[52] Nitti-Dolci's monograph appeared in 1938, and Upadhye's contributions to this topic ('A Note on Trivikrama's Date', 'Śubhacandra and his Prakrit Grammar', 'Prakrit Grammar Attributed to Samantabhadra') date to the same time.

[53] Pischel, *Grammar*, §33; Banerjee, *The Eastern School of Prakrit Grammarians*, pp. 31–32. On the date of Bhāmaha see most recently Bronner, 'A Question of Priority'.

of rules that would produce the forms of one language as a transformation (*vikṛti*) of the forms of a base language (*prakṛti*). The most important language in this set was the literary language that had earlier been known as Prakrit, but which received the more specific name of Mahārāṣṭrī under this new classificatory schema. Towards the end of the first millennium, Prakrit grammar was no longer the grammar of Prakrit, but the grammar of the Prakrits.

Typical of this tendency is the addition of several new chapters to Vararuci's *Prākṛtaprakāśa*.[54] These chapters were not included in most southern versions of the text, but they came to circulate with Bhāmaha's *Manoramā* commentary as the northern 'vulgate'. I will refer to their author as 'pseudo-Vararuci'. (Bhāmaha's commentary itself does not extend to the chapter on Śaurasenī.) These chapters describe Māgadhī, Paiśācī and Śaurasenī—precisely the three languages that Rudraṭa added to the older *bhāṣātraya* to produce his *bhāṣāṣaṭka*. Rudraṭa's commentator Namisādhu (1069) gives a brief description of each of the six languages. In doing so, Namisādhu explicitly ties Rudraṭa's classification to the grammatical principles that underlie it: these are not just six languages, but six languages that can be derived from each other by successive sets of regular transformations. Other multilingual grammars that might date from before Hemacandra (1089–1172) are Caṇḍa's *Prākṛtalakṣaṇa* and Kramadīśvara's *Saṃkṣiptasāra*.[55]

Scholars have long noted the similarity between Namisādhu's and pseudo-Vararuci's descriptions.[56] Their treatment of Paiśācī is indicative of the way in which this language was related to the other languages—principally Sanskrit and Prakrit—in a *grammatical* framework, which was crucial to the promotion of Paiśācī to the status of a 'full' language in more general formulations such as Rudraṭa's *ṣaḍbhāṣā*. What is interesting about these descriptions is that they both primarily consist in cancellations of rules for the 'base language' (*prakṛti*). Thus Namisādhu, who starts by saying that Paiśācī is the same as Prakrit with a few differences (*prākṛtam eva kiṃcidviśeṣāt paiśācikam*), has to say that several of the rules for Prakrit do not apply in Paiśācī (*prākṛtalakṣaṇāpavādaś cātra*). The cancellations relate to the lenition of intervocalic consonants and to the substitution of Sanskrit *jñ* with *ññ*, rather than *ṇṇ* as in Prakrit.[57] Paiśācī and Prakrit both lose the contrast between the dental and retroflex nasal, but Paiśācī ends up with *n* and Prakrit with *ṇ*. On the basis of just these rules, Paiśācī looks like Prakrit with Sanskrit

[54] See Nitti-Dolci, *The Prākrita Grammarians*, regarding the inauthenticity of these chapters.

[55] Nitti-Dolci believed that Caṇḍa was much later, but here I follow Pischel (*Grammar*, §34, §37), as well as Master and Upadhye.

[56] See for example Master, 'The Mysterious Paiśācī', p. 226.

[57] There are four processes of lenition that Namisādhu cancels: the voicing of voiceless retroflex stops (*ṭasya na ḍakāraḥ*, *thaṭhayor ḍho 'pi na bhavati*), the spirantisation of *p* (*pasya na vakāraḥ*), the debuccalisation of aspirate stops (*khaghathadhaphabhānāṃ ho na bhavati*) and the elision of unaspirated stops (*kagacajatadapayavānām anādau yathāprayogaṃ lopaḥ svaraśeṣatā ca na kartavyā*). I accept Pischel's emendation of *ññ* for *ñ* (*Grammar*, §276).

consonants, the kind of language that we now call 'Pali'. But Namisādhu takes care to mention a further characteristic of Paiśācī: not only is a Sanskrit *t* never changed, but sometimes even *d* is changed into *t* (*dasya vā takāraḥ*). The language thus described is similar to the language of the Paiśācī passage in the *Kuvalayamālā*, and on the basis of their shared form *hitapakaṃ* (for which pseudo-Vararuci and Kramadīśvara have *hitaakaṃ*), it seems likely that Namisādhu's description was based on just this passage—perhaps even the archetype of the extant Jaisalmer manuscript, which was copied in 1083.

Pseudo-Vararuci, by contrast, makes Śaurasenī the 'base-language' (10.2), even though Śaurasenī is not treated until the last chapter. In most of the rules, however, the form to be substituted is given in Sanskrit rather than Prakrit or Śaurasenī. Despite these problems, it is clear that most of the rules either reintroduce a Prakrit form that had been changed in Śaurasenī, or introduce the kinds of global substitutions that Namisādhu mentioned: *n* instead of *ṇ* everywhere, and *ññ* in place of Sanskrit *jñ*.[58]

There is one major difference between pseudo-Vararuci's and Namisādhu's analyses. Instead of Namisādhu's limited rule that makes *t* an occasional substitute for *d*, pseudo-Vararuci replaces *every single* intervocalic voiced stop with the corresponding voiceless stop, apart from conjuncts. Namisādhu and pseudo-Vararuci thus offer two different versions of the 'Paiśācī sound change', the devoicing of voiced consonants, that has dominated modern scholarship on the language.[59]

When we come to two other grammarians who are roughly contemporary with pseudo-Vararuci and Namisādhu, the picture becomes even more complex. Caṇḍa does not mention this 'Paiśācī sound change' at all in his *Prākṛtalakṣaṇa*. He only remarks that Paiśacī has *l* and *n* in place of *r* and *ṇ* respectively (3.38). The 'Paiśācī sound change' begins Kramadīśvara's treatment of Paiśācī in his *Saṃkṣiptasāra*—which has been transmitted in a very corrupt form—but here the substitution of all voiceless stops for voiced stops is *obligatory* and *without exception* (8.5.100–01).[60]

In all of these grammatical descriptions, Paiśācī takes its place alongside other languages, namely Śaurasenī and Māgadhī, that had not previously been included either in Prakrit grammar (for example, in the earlier version of the *Prākṛtaprakāśa*) or in programmatic schemas of literary language (for example, in the *bhāṣātraya*). This is not a coincidence. Śaurasenī and Māgadhī are, besides Sanskrit, the principal

[58] 10.10 also replaces Sanskrit *kanyā* with *kaññā*. The Prakrit forms reinstated by these rules are *piva* (10.4, although whether *piva* is properly a Prakrit word is open to discussion), *saneho* (10.7, Prakrit *saṇeho*), *bhariā* (10.8), and the converb in *-ūna* (10.13, Prakrit *-ūṇa*).

[59] Here is one of the few places I differ from Master. He wrote that pseudo-Vararuci, 'with Nam[isādhu]'s commentary in mind, framed a general rule and constructed examples for it' ('The Mysterious Paiśācī', p. 226). Pseudo-Vararuci could not do so without blatantly misunderstanding Namisādhu.

[60] Without exception, that is, according to the wording of the *sūtra*s (*vargādyau tri-caturthayoḥ*, *prākṛtasiddhatricaturthayoś ca*). One of the examples in the prose commentary to 8.5.101 is *śaggo* for *svargaḥ*, but the passage is corrupt.

languages of the theater. And it seems very likely that Prakrit grammar was affected by the larger reorientation of Sanskrit intellectual culture towards the theatre, of which Kashmir was the epicentre. We can think of this reorientation in narrow and broad senses. In the narrow sense, Prakrit grammar was repurposed as a form of theatrical knowledge. It supplied the names and categories and rules of formation for languages that could in principle be used on stage. If the earlier version of the *Prākṛtaprakāśa* served people who sought to compose *gāthā*s like those in the *Sattasaī*, its later version served people who sought to compose *nāṭaka*s like Śūdraka and Kālidāsa. Rājaśekhara is a good example of this shift: the only Prakrit that he wrote occurs in his plays, and this language more or less accords with the language described in the *Prākṛtaprakāśa*.[61] This narrow sense allows us to understand how Paiśācī came to be understood as one of several languages of the theatre. The *Nāṭyaśāstra* has a section (17.31–41) that assigns either Sanskrit or Prakrit to different classes of beings, and there Prakrit is assigned to people possessed by 'evil spirits' (*nīcagraha*, which Abhinavagupta plausibly interprets to include Piśācas). Nowhere is Paiśācī mentioned in the *Nāṭyaśāstra*.[62] Once Paiśācī was transformed into a Prakrit, however, there was no conceptual difficulty in assigning it to the appropriate kinds of characters. Dhanañjaya (later tenth century) allows Piśācas and very low characters to speak Paiśācī and Māgadhī respectively; later authors, in adapting Dhanañjaya, omitted 'respectively' and assigned Paiśācī to ghosts *as well as* very low characters (Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra), or exclusively to Śūdras (Śāradātanaya) or coal-burners (Viśvanātha).[63]

The narrow conception of Prakrit grammar as a form of theatrical knowledge, however, does not account for Paiśācī's inclusion within Prakrit grammar in the

[61] See Naikar, *The Prakrit Plays of India*, for Rājaśekhara's Prakrit. Many scholars have faulted Rājaśekhara for failing to observe the distinction between Śaurasenī and Mahārāṣṭrī (for example, Konow, *Rājaçekhara's Karpūramañjarī*). But the earlier version of Vararuci's *Prākṛtaprakāśa*, which Rājaśekhara probably used, has no such distinction. The source of his *deśya* vocabulary remains a question: he might have depended on some early *deśīkośa*s, or he might have adapted words from his local (Maharashtrian) vernacular, or both.

[62] Abhinavagupta, in commenting upon the *Nāṭyaśāstra*'s division of speech into 'languages' (*bhāṣā*) and 'sublanguages' (*vibhāṣā*) at 17.47–48, records the opinion of some scholars that the enumeration of languages is merely suggestive and that Paiśācī and other languages ought to be included as well (*anye tu nidarśanārthatvād asya paiśācādayo 'pi prayojyā ity āhuḥ*, p. 377 in vol. 2). J.S. Pade, in the introduction to the fourth volume of the Nāṭyaśāstra, suggested that Abhinavagupta quoted some verses in Paiśācī. I have been unable to trace them (nor am I alone: cf. von Hinüber, 'Die Paiśācī', n. 4), and I suspect that he referred to verses in corrupt Prakrit. If so, his usage of 'Paiśācī' in the sense of 'an irreparably corrupt passage' is a fitting and recent illustration of my general point that Paiśācī is always on the other side of what is known, what is familiar, and what makes sense.

[63] *piśācātyantanīcādau paiśācaṃ māgadhaṃ tathā* (*Daśarūpaka* 2.65*ab*); *atyantanīcabhūtādau paiśācī māgadhī ca vāk* (*Nāṭyadarpaṇa* 4.41*ab*); *paiśācyā bhāṣayā gānaṃ śūdrāṇāṃ māgadhī tu vā* (*Bhāvaprakāśana* p. 304); *tathaivāṅgārakārādau paiśācī syād piśācavāk* (*Sāhityadarpaṇa* 6.164*ab*). See Leclère, 'Ambivalent Representations of Muslims in Medieval Indian Theater', pp. 162–66, for the social significance of these assignments.

first place. For Paiśācī, unlike Śaurasenī and Māgadhī, was hardly ever used in theater. There are only a handful of actual examples, and all date from the thirteenth century, that is, in the wake of Hemacandra's synthesis (discussed below). Basile Leclère has studied the assignment of Paiśācī to Turkish or Muslim characters in these plays.[64] This forces us to move to a broader notion of the connection between Prakrit grammar and the theater: Prakrit grammar came to reflect the multilingual logic of *dṛśyakāvya* as the latter became an increasingly important to Sanskrit intellectuals. This did not mean that Prakrit grammar described *only* the languages of the stage, or even *all* of the languages of the stage; it meant that Prakrit grammar widened its scope from the classics of Prakrit literature to the multilingual genres of plays, stories and songs. Under these circumstances, Paiśācī became an object of grammatical analysis, something that could be chosen, produced and manipulated, and something that could serve as a source of literary beauty: in other words, a full-fledged language.

Bhoja's mention of Paiśācī in the *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* and the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* can serve as a summary of its journey from half-language to language and of its final position within the larger language order.[65] The second chapter of the *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* is concerned with adornments of language (*śabdālaṅkāra*s), and the first of these that Bhoja addresses is the type of language itself (*jāti*). Bhoja draws upon a range of sources, including Rājaśekhara, but he accepts as the six 'pure' (*śuddha*) types the *ṣaḍbhāṣā* of Rudraṭa. He assigns these six types to two apparently interlocking hierarchies: Sanskrit is for 'high' characters, Prakrit for 'middle' characters, and Māgadhī for 'low' characters; Paiśācī is for 'not quite high' characters, Śaurasenī for 'not quite middle' characters, and Apabhraṃśa for 'not quite low' characters. Bhoja's import is not quite clear—he gives no information about the speakers, and his commentator Rāmasiṃha has misunderstood the passage—but in his examples he appears to match the ethical or aesthetic content of the verse with the language's position on the scale.[66] As an example of Paiśācī he gave what would become the most frequently-cited Paiśācī passage: a verse in praise of Śiva, who bows at Gaurī's feet. Lacôte assigned the verse to the lost *Bṛhatkathā*, and the testimony of Bhoja's commentator Āsada

[64] Leclère, *ibid*. In the fourth act of Jayasiṃhasūri's *Hammīramadamardana* (1219–29), the Turuṣka ruler Mīlacchrīkāra, who stands in for the historical Sultan Iltutmish, and his minister Gorī Isapha speak the language that Hemacandra called Cūlikāpaiśācika. In Yaśaḥpāla's allegorical *Mohanaparājaya* (1229–32), the sisters Mārī (death) and Śūnā (pestilence) in the fourth act speak a kind of combination of Māgadhī and Paiśācī.

[65] See Pollock, *Language of the Gods*, pp. 581–84, for translations of (most of) the relevant sections.

[66] Pischel, *Grammar*, §27, would take *nātyuttamapātraprayojyā,* etc., as 'not to be employed by the highest characters', etc. Rāmasiṃha interprets these phrases as 'in between,' that is, Paiśācī is for characters who are 'in between high and middle' and Śaurasenī for characters who are 'in between middle and low', but he runs into a problem with Apabhraṃśa, and places it (with Śaurasenī) between middle and low.

(Ājaḍa) supports the attribution.[67] Konow rejected the attribution on the grounds that the passage concerns the assignment of language to characters in a play (*pātra*), and therefore Bhoja must have quoted it from a play, but it is likely that Bhoja is using *pātra* in a wider sense here.

After the 'pure' types, Bhoja discusses a variety of others. The bilingual type (*sādhāraṇa*) can be read as two different languages simultaneously; it corresponds to one of the varieties of *bhāṣāśleṣa* that Rudraṭa defines, and Bhoja's example of a Sanskrit–Paiśācī verse is in fact taken from Rudraṭa. Bhoja reserves the title of *bhāṣāśleṣa* for Rudraṭa's second variety, in which a verse carries a different meaning in each language. His example of a Sanskrit–Paiśācī *bhāṣāśleṣa* is a verse that simultaneously praises Śiva and Viṣṇu.[68]

In the *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa*, Bhoja is primarily concerned with the ways in which language can be purposely chosen and manipulated to create poetic beauty. Although his discussion implies and refers to various classificatory schemes, the schemes themselves are not the point. Moreover his basic question—under what circumstances does aesthetic value attach to the choice of language itself?—targets genres in which the use of particular *kinds* of language is a matter of choice and skill. In other words, the question is oriented towards the language-economy of *dṛśyakāvya* rather than *śravyakāvya*. Thus it should come as no surprise that the analytical framework of this section of the *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* is also based upon *dṛśyakāvya*: this includes the classification of languages and their projection onto a notional social order, as well as the vocabulary of 'characters' (*pātra*s), and indeed the very fact of being able to switch languages within a single composition.

Bhoja's analysis in the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* runs along much different lines. A part of the third *prakāśa* deals directly and at length with the different classifications of sentences (*vākya*, pp. 163–66). The first classification is based upon the *language* of the sentence, and here Bhoja returns to the foundational *bhāṣātraya* of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin: a sentence can be either Sanskrit, Prakrit or Apabhraṃśa. Beyond this top-level tri-partition, however, Bhoja's analysis is quite idiosyncratic. He manages to fold the *ṣaḍbhāṣā* into the *bhāṣātraya* by classifying the three 'additional' languages—Śaurasenī, Māgadhī and Paiśācī—as sub-varieties of Prakrit. Many of the same example verses that he had cited in the *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* reappear here, including the verse in 'pure' Paiśācī. Bhoja uniquely divided Prakrit into three categories: natural (*sahaja*), derived (*lakṣita*) and distorted (*śliṣṭa*).[69] Paiśāca and Māgadha belong to the last category, evidently so-called because they are transformations, or rather deformations, of the 'derived' language Śaurasena (recall that pseudo-Vararuci made Śaurasenī the *prakṛti* of Paiśācī). Once again,

[67] I count four citations of the verse, which is given as E in the appendix, two of which are from Bhoja. See Lacôte, *Essai*, pp. 203–04, and Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, p. 855) for the ascription to Guṇāḍhya.

[68] For these verses and their translations see the Appendix.

[69] See Pollock, *Language of the Gods*, pp. 107–08, from which I take the translation of *śliṣṭa*.

it is grammar that places Paiśācī within a field of derivation that relates it systematically to Sanskrit and Prakrit.

I have sketched out the circumstances in which and pathways through which Paiśācī, once regarded as a non-language, came to be regarded as a language. This process was neither inevitable nor straightforward. Although Paiśācī found a relatively stable place among the 'six languages', it was fundamentally unlike the other five in one respect: nobody, it seems, had access to extensive enough and authoritative enough texts *in Paiśācī* to say decisively *what Paiśācī was like*. I will explain why I believe this is so in the next section. To conclude this section, I will use Hemacandra's influential but deeply-flawed discussion of Paiśācī to show just how tenuous and 'ghostly' this language remained, even after it was enshrined among the 'six languages'.

Hemacandra (1089–1192) wrote his *Siddhahemacandra* using Rudraṭa's model of 'the six languages'. The first seven books of the *Siddhahemacandra* provide a grammar of Sanskrit; the eighth book covers Prakrit, Śaurasenī, Māgadhī, Paiśācī and Apabhraṃśa. As far as Paiśācī is concerned, Hemacandra introduced a great deal of confusion. One example is his misinterpretation of pseudo-Vararuci's rule on 'Paiśācī sound change', the devoicing of intervocalic stops: pseudo-Vararuci limited the scope of this rule with *ayujor*, 'consonants that are not combined with other consonants'; Hemacandra understood this word as 'excluding forms of the verbal root *yuj*'.[70] In his commentary, Hemacandra supplies a long list of made-up examples to go with his made-up rule: thus, according to Bhāmaha's commentary on pseudo-Vararuci, Sanskrit *vyāghraḥ* is replaced by *vaggho*; according to Hemacandra, it is replaced by *vakkho*.

Hemacandra dealt with the different versions of the 'Paiśācī sound change' in his sources by grouping them into what scholars have subsequently considered different dialects. Thus the Paiśācī described by Namisādhu, and consonant with the extract in the *Kuvalayamālā*, falls under 'Paiśācī' (8.4.303–24), while the Paiśācī described by pseudo-Vararuci (and, where intelligible, by Kramadīśvara) falls under 'Cūlikāpaiśācika' (8.4.325–28). Scholars have long wondered about this latter designation. Under the influence of the 'ethnographic' approach of George Grierson, some scholars assumed that it referred to a particular group of people who spoke this kind of language. Bagchi thought the *cūlika*s were Sogdians, and Master interpreted *cūlikā* as 'hill' and loosely translated the term as *jaṅglī bāt*.[71]

It should however be clear by now that, before Hemacandra at least, *Paiśācī was never specifically associated with any group of human speakers, except by mistake*. If we recall the double movement in which Paiśācī enters into Prakrit grammar at the same time that Prakrit grammar reorients itself towards the theatre, then a much more convincing explanation of Hemacandra's

[70] Nitti-Dolci was the first (that I know of) to note this mistake in her *Prākrita Grammarians*.

[71] Bagchi, 'Sulika, Cūlikā, and Cūlikā-Paiśācī'; Master, 'The Mysterious Paiśācī'.

Cūlikāpaiśācika becomes available: Hemacandra imagined this variety of Paiśācī to be employed in a *cūlikā* (that is, *cūlikāpaiśācīka* is a *tādarthya-caturthī-tatpuruṣa-samāsa*). Although the *cūlikā* is not mentioned in the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, it becomes part of the standard vocabulary of theatre starting with Dhanañjaya's *Daśarūpaka* in the tenth century.[72] There Dhanañjaya defines it as 'the indication of an event by people who are hidden behind the screen'.[73] Later authors often add that the *cūlikā* is recited by bards (*sūta*s or *māgadha*s).[74] It is usually mentioned in connection with other kinds of plot-summaries (for example, *mukhāṅka*, *garbhāṅka*, *aṅkāvatāra*), although the distinction between them is tenuous and was rejected by Abhinavagupta.[75] What appears to define the *cūlikā* for Sāgaranandin is that it refers to an event or situation which is not currently represented on the stage. Hemacandra probably understood the examples he quotes of 'Cūlikāpaiśācika' to be sung by bards off-stage. The first is identical to the 'pure Paiśācī' verse quoted in the *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* (*panamata*…) and perhaps ultimately from the *Bṛhatkathā*, although its language stands somewhere between Bhoja's Paiśācī and Cūlikapaiśācīka as Hemacandra himself defines it.[76] The second, in the relatively rare *gīti* or *udgātha* meter, is another verse in praise of Śiva which I have not traced elsewhere. Notably, both quotations of Cūlikāpaiśācika are in verse, and all of the quotations that Hemacandra gives of 'plain' Paiśācī are in prose.

Notwithstanding his errors, Hemacandra's influence on the later history, both literary theory and Prakrit grammar was profound, especially among Jains. He confirmed the earlier inclusion of Paiśācī within the *ṣaḍbhāṣā*s, which defined the parameters of literary discourse; what is more, his grammar served both as an extended argument for Paiśācī's status as a language and as a set of instructions for how to produce it. Instead of standing *outside* the sphere of cosmopolitan culture, Paiśācī was now seen as standing *inside* of it. As a result, projects that sought to represent this sphere *in toto* sometimes included Paiśācī in its new role as the 'kitchen sink' of cosmopolitan culture. The first example of such a project is Hemacandra's own *Kumārapālacarita*, a poem about the deeds of his patron Kumārapāla which he wrote to accompany and exemplify his grammar. Verses 6–13 in the eighth *sarga*, which describe the superiority of Jainism to other ascetic practices, exemplify Hemacandra's rules for Paiśācī and Cūlikapaiśācika.

[72] A number of spurious verses in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* (19.110–13) deal with the *cūlikā*, among other types of plot-summaries.

[73] *antarjavanikāsaṃsthaiś cūlikārthasya sūcanā* (*Daśarūpaka* 1.61*cd*).

[74] For example, *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* 11.208 and 11.393; *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* 1.26, *Sāhityadarpaṇa* 6.58, *Bhāvaprakāśana* p. 214, and cf. Dillon et al., 'The Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa of Sāgaranandin', pp. 15–16.

[75] See Abhinavagupta's commentary on *Nāṭyaśāstra* 18.14 (pp. 417–18 of vol. 2).

[76] In Hemacandra's version, all of the initial consonants are voiceless (for example, *tasasu*, *-tappanesuṃ*, *-thalaṃ*, are in agreement with 8.4.325 and in disagreement with 8.4.327, which represents pseudo-Vararuci's more limited rule), while geminate consonants remain voiced (for example, *calanagga-lagga-*, *luddaṃ*, in disagreement with Hemacandra's own rule, 8.4.325, but in agreement with pseudo-Vararuci).

These two texts—the *Siddhahemacandra* and the *Kumārapālacarita*—paved the way for a new genre, the multilingual *stotra*. The powers of language had long interested authors of *stotra*s: one example is the *bhāṣāśleṣa* verse cited by Bhoja (*Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* 2.164) that simultaneously praises Viṣṇu (in Sanskrit) and Śiva (in Paiśācī); another example is Ānandavardhana's well-known verse in the *Devīśataka* (74) that can be read in all of the six languages, according to the commentator Kayyaṭa. The *ṣaḍbhāṣā-stotra*, however, is a particularly Jain genre that directly thematises the multiplicity and totality of language. The *stotra*s known to me that employ some form of Paiśācī are:[77] Dharmavardhana's *Ṣaḍbhāṣānir mitapārśvajinastavana* (first quarter of the thirteenth century); Jinaprabhasūri's *Śrīṛṣabhamahādevādidevastava* and *Śrīcandraprabhugīta* (1292–1312); Jinapadmasūri's *Śāntināthastavana* (1381–1400); and *stotra*s to Ṛṣabha, Śānti, Nemi, Pārśva and Vardhamāna by Somasundara (fifteenth century).

I will not go into much detail about the later history of Paiśācī in Prakrit grammar. The majority of the texts are based on Hemacandra (Trivikrama, Lakṣmīdhara, Śubhacandra). There are, however, two important points to be made about the treatment of Paiśācī among the 'eastern grammarians' Puruṣottama, Rāmaśarman and Mārkaṇḍeya.[78] First, these authors share a taxonomy that distinguishes several 'pure' varieties of Paiśācī, onto which Rāmaśarman overlays another taxonomy of mixture, rather similar to Bhoja's in the *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa*. The 'pure' varieties are named after regions, and among them, the most important—and most similar to the descriptions of other grammarians—is Kaikeya Paiśācī. To previous scholars, these names refer to the locales where Paiśācī was actually spoken, and the language's association with the Kekayas was adduced by Grierson in support of his theory of a north-western origin. I remain very doubtful about how probative this kind of evidence is. For the eastern grammarians, Paiśācī serves as one of the four super-ordinate categories of language, along with *bhāṣā*, *vibhāṣā* and *apabhraṃśa*, and its internal structure is similar to theirs but markedly less developed: Puruṣottama even says that 'the other varieties of Paiśācī [namely, besides Kaikeya and Śaurasena] have very few differences and must be learned from practice'.[79] I would not be the first to suggest that these authors simply slotted Paiśācī into a pre-existing template according to which each major category of language could claim a number of regional, or notionally regional, dialects.[80] Mārkaṇḍeya even offers some resistance to the idea that there are regional varieties of Paiśācī. After quoting a verse that lists eleven regional varieties, he attempts

[77] This list is based on Schubring, 'Prakrit-Dichtung und Prakrit-Grammatik', and Upadhye, 'Paiśācī Language and Literature'.

[78] See Grierson, 'The Eastern School of Prakrit Grammarians'—with caution—for a discussion of the Paiśācī sections of Rāmaśarman and Mārkaṇḍeya.

[79] *pāñcālādayaḥ svalpabhedā lokataḥ* (*Prākṛtānuśāsana* 20.18).

[80] Master ('The Mysterious Paiśācī') thought that the eastern grammarians were hopelessly confused about Paiśācī.

to narrow his own focus to the three types that are urbane and associated with literature (*nāgara*), for it is very difficult to state in words the differences between the other types.[81] The implication is that these three types are the ones that matter. Though it is still unclear what it would mean for a variety of Paiśācī to 'matter' to a grammarian in Orissa in the later sixteenth century, being connected with the tradition of the *Bṛhatkathā* certainly counted for something. Mārkaṇḍeya mentions that examples of Kaikeya Paiśācī can be found in the *Bṛhatkathā*, and purports to give a two-word quotation: *kupaci pisālaṃ*.[82]

Always in Translation

Mārkaṇḍeya's alleged quotation from the *Bṛhatkathā*—a mere two words, one of which is actually *pisālaṃ* (*piśāca*)—has raised a number of questions: did he have access to a text called *Bṛhatkathā*, and if so, was this the original Paiśācī *Bṛhatkathā*? These questions are important, but they are also slightly naive.[83] What if we did not take for granted an 'original Paiśācī *Bṛhatkathā*'? What if, instead of assuming there *was* a *Bṛhatkathā* for Mārkaṇḍeya to quote from, we asked what the *Bṛhatkathā* might have meant to him? And to zoom out to the larger picture: in what ways is our knowledge of Paiśācī bound up with the story of the *Bṛhatkathā*?

By the 'story of the *Bṛhatkathā*' I really mean two different but closely intertwined stories. The first narrates the life of the text as a text: its composition, publication, circulation and eventual disappearance. One might call this the 'text in history' approach. The second tells how the text was used, transformed, translated, remembered and forgotten. It is similar to a reception history, or Gadamerian *Wirkungsgeschichte*, but in contrast to the preceding, I prefer to call it the 'text in memory' approach. In the case of the *Bṛhatkathā*, as for many lost texts, the 'text in history' is contained, even hidden, within the 'text in memory'. In other words, in order to even have a chance of getting to history, one needs to go through memory. And memory is not as easy to navigate as many people assume.

The story of the *Bṛhatkathā*, as it is usually told, is a classic 'lost text' story.[84] Once upon a time, Guṇāḍhya wrote a text called the *Bṛhatkathā*—the 'Great Story'—in a language called Paiśācī about the adventures of Udayana and his son Naravāhanadatta. Scholars are not exactly sure where and when he wrote it.

[81] The verse he quotes after *Prākṛtasarvasva* 1.2: *kāñcīdeśīyapāṇḍye ca pāñcālaṃ gauḍamāgadham | vrācaḍaṃ dākṣiṇātyaṃ ca śaurasenaṃ ca kaikeyam | śābaraṃ drāviḍaṃ caiva ekādaśa piśācajāḥ*. The number eleven may have come from the Paiśācī verse that mentions Śiva's eleven forms. Mārkaṇḍeya's response (*Prākṛtasarvasva* 1.6): *kaikeyaṃ śaurasenaṃ ca pāñcālam iti ca tridhā | paiśācyo nāgarā yasmāt tenāpy anyā na lakṣitāḥ ||*.

[82] *bṛhatkathāyām 'kupaci pisālaṃ'* (*Prākṛtasarvasva* 19.9).

[83] Grierson ('The Bṛhatkathā in Mārkaṇḍeya') concluded that Mārkaṇḍeya had the *Bṛhatkathā* before him.

[84] For dated overviews see Keith, *History of Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 266–88 and Lacôte, *Essai*; see also Nelson, '*Bṛhatkathā* Studies: The Problem of an Ur-text'.

Some place Guṇāḍhya at the court of a Sātavāhana king in the Deccan. Others put him near Ujjayinī.[85] Others place him further east, in Kauśāmbī.[86] In any case, he lived in the early centuries of the Common Era. The Udayana cycle that furnishes portions of the *Bṛhatkathā*'s plot was relatively popular in early art and literature.[87] But explicit literary and epigraphic references to Guṇāḍhya, the *Bṛhatkathā* and Paiśācī only begin to appear in the sixth century. In what may be the earliest surviving reference, the Gaṅga king Durvinīta claimed to have rendered the *Bṛhatkathā* into Sanskrit in an inscription of the mid-sixth century.[88] Subsequently the text is mentioned frequently in literature: Subandhu, Bāṇa, Daṇḍin and so on. Guṇāḍhya even appears in a ninth-century inscription from Cambodia, where he forms part of an 'apparent contradiction' (*virodhābhāsa*): King Yaśovarman I is described as 'a Guṇāḍhya who hates Prakrit' (*guṇāḍhyaḥ prākṛtāpriyaḥ*), which evidently struck ninth-century ears as contradictory, because it is resolved as 'rich in virtue and not fond of base things'.[89]

There are a number of works that are often considered to be 'translations' or 'transcreations' either of the original *Bṛhatkathā* or of a 'second-generation' work that was based on it. The earliest among these (pre-sixth century) appears to be the *Vasudevahiṃḍī*, written in Prakrit by the Jain monk Saṃghadāsa.[90] In Nepal, Budhasvāmin produced a Sanskrit version, the *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṅgraha*, sometime in the second half of the first millennium. Around the same time, but on the other end of the subcontinent, one Koṅkuvēḷ composed a Tamil version, the *Peruṅkatai*.[91] The best-known versions are the two produced in Kashmir in the eleventh century: Kṣemendra's *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* (first half of the century), and Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara* (1063–82).[92] These two works were based not on the *Bṛhatkathā* itself but on a Kashmiri intermediary. Earlier scholars generally followed Lacôte in assuming that this 'Kashmiri *Bṛhatkathā*' was composed in Paiśācī, or in any case in some language other than Sanskrit. But Tsuchida has argued convincingly that it too was in Sanskrit—he suggests that it was called the *Bṛhatkathāsāra*—and that there were still other Sanskrit versions of the story circulating in Kashmir.[93] At some point, however, the last manuscript of the 'original *Bṛhatkathā*' crumbled to dust, leaving only these traces.

[85] Konow, 'The Home of Paiśācī'.

[86] Von Hinüber, 'Die Paiśācī und die Entstehung der Sakischen Orthographie'.

[87] See Adaval, *The Story of King Udayana*, and Zin, 'The Oldest Painting of the Udayana Legend'.

[88] *devabhāratīnibaddhavaḍḍakathena* (Pollock, *Language of the Gods*, p. 166; Master, 'The Mysterious Paiśācī', pp. 35–36; Narasimhachar, 'An Old Sanskrit Version of the Brhatkatha').

[89] Master, 'The Mysterious Paiśācī', p. 43; and Vijayalakshmy, *A Study of the Peruṅkatai*, p. 12.

[90] Alsdorf, 'The Vasudevahiṇḍi, a Specimen of Archaic Jaina-Māhārāṣṭrī'.

[91] Vijayalakshmy, *A Study of the Peruṅkatai* and 'The Tamil Peruṅkatai'.

[92] For the dating of these works see Tsuchida, 'Über die direkte Quelle für die kaschmirischen Versionen der Bṛhatkathā' with references.

[93] *Ibid*.

Or so goes the commonly-accepted story. Most scholars who have worked on the *Bṛhatkathā* have felt the need to affirm that there *was* an original Paiśācī *Bṛhatkathā*, as if to pre-emptively counter the charge that there is actually very little evidence for such a text. As noted above, there is not a single plausible *citation* of the 'original Paiśācī *Bṛhatkathā*', in the sense of an explicit indication furnished by an author that the precise words he is quoting belong to the *Bṛhatkathā*. This is not to say that there are no plausible *fragments* available. Hemacandra provides a few Paiśācī sentences that Vijayalakshmy has plausibly traced to the Viracitā episode, which is otherwise only represented in the *Peruṅkatai*.[94] Hemacandra, however, does not say *where* these quotations are taken from. Raghavan argued that Bhoja quoted part of the story of the gambler Geṇṭākarāla, which forms part of the longer story of Vikramāditya and Kaliṅgasenā, in his *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*.[95] It may have been self-evident to Bhoja and his readers that the *Kaliṅgasenālambha* was a section of the *Bṛhatkathā*. But again, the quotation is short, corrupt and not overtly identified as belonging to the 'original Paiśācī *Bṛhatkathā*'. Despite the scarcity of plausible fragments, the impact of the *Bṛhatkathā* is so profound, and it is referred to so frequently, that it might seem perverse to question whether an original Paiśācī *Bṛhatkathā* even existed. But the *Bṛhatkathā* is not a regular text—in at least two specific ways which I will discuss below—and thus we might miss something important if we treat it like one. Pollock suggested that it 'seems to have existed less as an actual text than as a conceptual category signifying the *Volksgeist*, the Great Repository of Folk Narratives'.[96] The point, which Pollock probably presses too far here, is that the *Bṛhatkathā* has a very special position in the history of literature, and indeed of textuality, in South Asia.

The *Bṛhatkathā* is unique, first of all, in that it is widely reported to have been composed in the language of the ghosts. Now putting stories into the mouths of ghosts, ghouls, zombies or other supernatural creatures is not at all strange in the story-literature of South Asia—it borders on a generic requirement—but in every other case this is generally acknowledged to be a narrative strategy. What would it really mean for a major text, in terms of both length and influence, to have been composed in 'the language of the ghosts'? This is indeed a tough proposition. It is no wonder that most scholars have immediately jumped to the conclusion that the phrase cannot possibly mean what it means: the language of the ghosts must be the language of forest-dwellers, or foreigners, or some other variety of human 'outsiders'. The eastern Prakrit grammarians offer some license for this interpretation, but as noted above, their representation of Paiśācī is extremely schematic and idiosyncratic, and was recognised as such already by Mārkaṇḍeya. In general, the only motivation for such euhemeristic explanations as offered by Grierson and

[94] Vijayalakshmy, 'The Tamil Peruṅkatai and its Relation to the Bṛhatkathā'.

[95] Raghavan, 'The Original Paiśācī Bṛhatkathā.' See also Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, pp. 850–55, and Appendix F.

[96] Pollock, *Language of the Gods*, p. 92.

Konow is the impossibility of placing 'the language of the ghosts' within a realistic and historical picture of language in South Asia. But that very impossibility may be the point.

The *Bṛhatkathā* is unique in a second respect, which is closely related to the first: it seems to be always already translated. The earliest datable reference to the text, Durvinīta's, mentions its being rendered into the language of the gods. And the translation of the *Bṛhatkathā* is a major theme in later eulogies of Guṇāḍhya. One example is Dhanapāla's *Tilakamañjarī* (v. 21):

> *satyaṃ bṛhatkathāmbhodher bindum ādāya saṃskṛtā* |
> *tenetarakathāḥ kanthāḥ pratibhānti tadagrataḥ* ||
>
> True, other stories have taken a drop from the ocean that is the *Bṛhatkathā* and *have been made pure*/*are in Sanskrit*. But those other stories (*kathāḥ*) look like tattered rags (*kanthāḥ*) in comparison.

I suggest that the *Bṛhatkathā*'s association with translation, both in its 'actual' textual history and in the memory of Indian literary culture, is not an accident—not something imposed on in from outside—but is built into the *Bṛhatkathā* itself. This close, *internal* association with translation casts doubt upon the existence of an 'original Paiśācī *Bṛhatkathā*'. Tsuchida adduces some very interesting evidence in this direction, notwithstanding his own affirmation of an *Urtext*.[97] A central theme of the first chapter, the *kathāpīṭha*, is that the *gaṇa* Mālyavān must wander the earth in human form as Guṇāḍhya until he gets the *Bṛhatkathā* published. That is why, in the Kashmiri versions at least, Guṇāḍhya—the human form of Mālyavān—asks for the support of the learned and liberal king Sātavāhana. Sātavāhana initially rejects Guṇāḍhya's proposal, primarily because he is disgusted with the text's 'ghoulish language'. Eventually, however, he seeks out Guṇāḍhya and offers to publish the text. Crucially, Sātavāhana enlists the help of two of Guṇāḍhya's students to 'revive' (*āśvāsya*) the text, and he himself composes the *kathāpīṭha* in part 'to explain how the text came to be transmitted in the language that it was in' (*Kathāsaritsāgara* 1.8.37):

> *tābhyāṃ saha ca kathāṃ tām āśvāsya sa sātavāhanas tasyāḥ* |
> *tadbhāṣayāvatāraṃ vaktuṃ cakre kathāpīṭham* ||

[97] 'Obwohl uns außer phantastischen Erzählungen keine Nachricht über Guṇāḍhyas Leben und Werk erhalten geblieben ist, so sollten wir doch nicht in Zweifel ziehen, daß einst eine von einem bestimmten Dichter in der Paiśācī-Sprache abgefaßte Geschichte über die Abenteuer des Prinzen Naravāhanadatta wirklich vorhanden war' (Although no information about Guṇāḍhya's life and work has been preserved, apart from fantastic stories, we should nevertheless not doubt that at one time a narrative was actually available that was written by a particular poet in the Paiśācī language about the adventures of the prince Naravāhanadatta.) (Tsuchida, 'Über die direkte Quelle für die kaschmirischen Versionen der Bṛhatkathā', p. 211). He seems to think that the original coexisted with a more-or-less contemporary Sanskrit translation.

Here the *kathāpīṭha* itself mentions translation as one of its central themes. But translation is only part of the 'the descent of the text' (*tasyā avatāraṃ*). The larger question is how an enormous collection of stories, written in blood, in an inhuman language, by a forest-dwelling ascetic, came to be one of the most famous specimens of story--literature in South Asia, perhaps in the entire world. Pollock's assessment—that the *Bṛhatkathā* represents the *Volksgeist*—represents the situation that the *kathāpīṭha* seeks to explain. We should therefore think about what 'publication', or more precisely 'renown' (*pratiṣṭhā*), could mean in this context. It means circulating in manuscript form; it means circulating *widely*; and it means circulating with the recommendation and perhaps ascription of someone who is already well established in literary culture. Tsuchida noted that this process almost certainly involved rendering the *Bṛhatkathā* into a 'landläufig' language such as Sanskrit.[98] One account of the *Bṛhatkathā*'s publication actually involves a request for its patron to *translate* it from Paiśācī into Sanskrit (*Nepālamāhātmya* 28.61):

piśācabhāṣayā rājan kṛtā gāthā manoharāḥ |
navalakṣamitās tās tvaṃ saṃskṛtena likhāpaya ||

According to this cultural logic, language is one of the conditions of existence for a literary text. If a story is to make the passage from 'mere story' to 'literature', it needs to be written down in one of the languages that literature is written down in. Note that this is exactly the point of the *bhāṣātraya* discussed earlier—the three languages that form the conditions of textual existence. Note, too, that this logic belongs to a specific place and time: it is one of the basic features of cosmopolitan culture. The notion that literature must be composed in a 'cosmopolitan' language such as Sanskrit is closely tied to the emergence of cosmopolitan literary culture around the first and second centuries CE. In connection with the 'always-already-translated' status of the *Bṛhatkathā*, it is worth pointing out that the suffix in the adjective *bhūtabhāṣāmayī* (in *Kāvyādarśa* 1.38) has the sense of *vikāra* or 'derivation', as Ratnaśrījñāna points out.[99] The adjective could therefore mean 'that which is *derived from* the language of the ghosts' besides its more commonsense meaning, 'that which is *in* the language of the ghosts' (assuming, once again, that *bhūta* means 'ghost', an assumption we will turn to, shortly).

In the foregoing pages I have sketched a picture of Paiśācī that is based on a reading of the sources that mention or describe it. Here I will summarise what that picture looks like, and then briefly reflect on the nature of the sources and the methodological problems that they generate.

Paiśācī is like a ghost. Sometimes it shows up in discussions of literary language, and sometimes it does not. Sometimes it appears as a 'half-language'. But like a ghost, you hear about Paiśācī much more often than you actually see it.

[98] *Ibid*., p. 236.

[99] The suffix *mayaḌ* has the sense of *vikāra* according to *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 4.3.143.

We tell these ghost-stories, like 'the *Bṛhatkathā* was originally composed in Paiśācī', because we've heard them, or so we think, from people like Daṇḍin. Of course, there have been a few sightings. But when Hemacandra quotes a few sentences of Paiśācī, and does not tell us what his sources are, should we conclude that these are taken from the 'original Paiśācī *Bṛhatkathā*'? The other sightings are just as problematic. Bhoja does not name his sources, either, and the quotations in the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* are highly corrupt. The *bhāṣāśleṣa* verses adduced by Rudraṭa and Bhoja are literary games or puzzles, and the *stotra*s composed by Jain monks after Hemacandra's example are similarly playful: these verses are universally acknowledged to hearken back to the rules of Prakrit grammarians rather than a pre-existing tradition of Paiśācī literature.

But what about the characteristics that all of these apparitions of Paiśācī share? Do we have to assume that there *was* a literary tradition that exhibited these characteristics or not? We should be much more sceptical of arguments such as this. The reality is that Paiśācī is almost exactly what Middle Indic would look like if you abstracted it away from all of the individual literary languages, such as Prakrit/Mahārāṣṭrī and Śaurasenī. It looks like a 'generic' Middle Indic, with the following generic features:

1. No super-heavy syllables, thus only *short* vowels in closed syllables, and no more than *one* consonant at the end of a syllable (and by implication no *ai* or *au*).
2. No complex onsets, thus no more than *one* consonant at the beginning of a syllable.
3. No heterorganic consonant clusters (thus the only permitted consonant clusters are geminates such as *-tt-* and nasal–stop sequences such as *-ṃt-*).
4. No *ṛ*.
5. Only one sibilant phoneme.

It is precisely these 'generic' features that makes Paiśācī suitable for *bhāṣāśleṣa*, for any attempt to compose a verse in Sanskrit and Prakrit simultaneously will *de facto* have these features. In contrast to most Middle Indic languages, however, Paiśācī does not have lenition of single intervocalic consonants. But this characteristic appears differently in different sources, and often as a *fortition* of intervocalic consonants:

1. Simple lack of lenition (Namisādhu).
2. An optional fortition of single intervocalic *d* (Namisādhu).
3. An obligatory fortition of single intervocalic *d* (Hemacandra's Paiśācī).
4. An optional fortition of *all* single intervocalic voiced stops (Kuvalayamālā, Bhoja?).
5. An obligatory fortition of *all* single intervocalic voiced stops (pseudo-Vararuci).
6. An obligatory fortition of *all* voiced stops (Hemacandra's Cūlikapaiśācika, Kramadīśvara).

I have arranged these features in order, from the rule that generates the forms closes to Sanskrit and the aforementioned 'generic' Middle Indic (which we might call *paiśācī mitior* on the model of Ahrens' treatment of Doric Greek), to the rule that generates the forms furthest from them (which we might call *paiśācī severior*). The order is also roughly chronological, which suggests that Master and Sani were correct: as time goes on, Paiśācī is imagined to be more and more 'unnatural'. Again, this trend suggests to me that, at least for all of the sources available to us, Paiśācī is largely a product of the imagination. To return to the ghost analogy: the fact that we all have a relatively similar idea of what ghosts look like and sound like *does not* imply that we actually believe in ghosts, much less that there actually are, or were, ghosts. And if we look back to the earliest specimens of Paiśācī available—Uddyotanasūri and (probably) Jineśvara—we have there the exact literary equivalent of putting on a scary voice when telling ghost-stories. Uddyotana even tells us that he included bits of Paiśācī in his story 'for fun' (*koūhaleṇa*).[100] By the time we get to Mārkaṇḍeya, it is hard to resist the conclusion that his two-word quotation of the *Bṛhatkathā* is hearsay based upon imagination or mistake.[101]

'The mysterious Paiśācī' was, it seems, no less mysterious to premodern than to modern authors. Their ideas of Paiśācī were not stable or consistent. Most importantly, all of these authors stood within a particular language order: the culture which they inhabited, and indeed which they were instrumental in defining and theorising, was one in which Sanskrit was the preeminent vehicle of systematic thought and literary expression, and in which Prakrit—or 'the Prakrits'—was still an important literary language. Paiśācī was not part of this language order in any significant way; certainly no major works are known to have been written in Paiśācī in the whole history of the 'Sanskrit cosmopolis'. To rephrase a point made above: this culture leaves no space for Paiśācī. When Paiśācī *is* included in schemas of literary language—which, I repeat, is a secondary development—its status remains marginal, and it retains a ghostly aura of mystery and obscurity. We must bear this in mind when reading and interpreting authors of this period: the *Siddhahemacandra* is not the *Linguistic Survey of India*.

Historicising Paiśācī

The question that remains is a fundamental one: where, ultimately, does Paiśācī come from? From the foregoing discussion it is clear that such a question has several dimensions: the use of the name 'Paiśācī' or one of its variants, the position of Paiśācī within an ordered system of literary and non-literary languages, the grammatical features assigned to it, its association with the *Bṛhatkathā*,

[100] *koūhaleṇa katthaï para-vayaṇa-vaseṇa sakkaya-ṇibaddhā | kiṃci avabbhaṃsa-kayā dāviya-pesāya-bhāsillā* || (*Kuvayalamālā* §7, p. 4 l. 12).

[101] One of Mārkaṇḍeya's quoted words, *kupaci*, appears earlier—without any reference to the *Bṛhatkathā*—in Puruṣottama (19.20) and in Rāmaśarman (3.3.5).

and the status of the *Bṛhatkathā* as an *Urtext* all stand in need of a compelling historical explanation.

The two most promising suggestions are those of Master and von Hinüber, both of whom have pointed to Paiśācī's similarity to Pali. Master's claim that Paiśācī was a 'perversion of Pāli' could be interpreted in two ways. It could mean that Paiśācī *was* Pali, and was misrecognised, perhaps intentionally, by Brahmanical authors. This interpretation would imply a 'demonisation' of Buddhist textual practices.[102] The second interpretation, which I believe is closer to what Master had in mind, is that Paiśācī actually represents a parallel textual tradition to Pali: around the time that Buddhists were writing texts in the language that would come to be known as Pali, non-Buddhists were writing texts in a very similar language that would come to be known as Paiśācī. Thus Master offered two intriguing alternative translations for the term *bhūtabhāṣā*: besides 'language of the ghosts', it could mean 'obsolete language', or 'the language of Śiva' (as *bhūteśvara*, *bhūtacārin*, *bhūtanātha*, etc.).[103] The tradition of the *Bṛhatkathā* has some notable Śaiva tendencies: at least in the Kashmiri versions, the story itself originated from Śiva's mouth.

Von Hinüber's argument represents an extension of the first interpretation of Master's position. Because he interprets the 'Paiśācī sound change' as an exclusively orthographic phenomenon, he is able to more or less identify Paiśācī and Pali. In his 1985 article, he considers Paiśācī as one of two major varieties of Buddhist Middle Indic, the other being Pali. He places Paiśācī in the east and Pali in the west, but the geographic difference is apparently not important: according to von Hinüber, references to Paiśācī in Prakrit grammar or in later Buddhist traditions can be interpreted as references to Pali. This interpretation is admirable for its economy: it simultaneously accounts for the absence of Pali from discourse about language in mainland India and for the absence of Paiśācī from the textual record, for on this hypothesis, we have been looking for both under the wrong names. The description of Paiśācī as a 'variety of Buddhist Middle Indic', however, is misleading. As far as I am aware, there is only one tradition that explicitly connects Paiśācī with Buddhism: this is Bu-ston's (1290–1364) story of the separation of Buddhism into four principal *nikāya*s at the time of the Second Buddhist Council.[104] According to this story, the *nikāya*s were (at least in part) divided by language: the Mūlasarvāstivādins used Sanskrit (*legs par sbyar ba*), the Mahāsāṃghikas used Prakrit (*tha mal pa*), the Saṃmitīyas used Apabhraṃśa (*zur chags pa*), and the Sthaviravādins used Paiśācī (*ša za'i skad*). But Bu-ston relates several *different* traditions in this connection. One, which originates with Śākyaprabha's mention of four languages in his

[102] We can discern a similar will to misremember in the reascription of Trivikrama's Prakrit grammar to 'Vālmīki' (see Upadhye, 'Vālmīki-Sūtras, A Myth').

[103] Master, 'The Mysterious Paiśācī', p. 39.

[104] For this tradition see Seyfort Ruegg, 'Über die Nikāyas der Śrāvakas und den Ursprung der philosophischen Schulen des Buddhismus nach den Tibetischen Quellen' and Yuyama, 'Bu-ston on the Languages Used by Indian Buddhists at the Schismatic Period'.

Prabhāvatī (eighth century or earlier) and which reappears in Padmākaraghoṣa's *Bhikṣuvarṣāgrapṛcchā* (tenth–eleventh century), assigns to the Sthaviravādins not Paiśācī but the 'mittlere Rezitations-Sprache' (*'briṅ du 'don pa'i tshig* or *bar mar 'don pa'i tshig*).[105] According to another tradition related by Bu-ston, it is the Mahāsāṃghikas who speak the 'mittlere Rezitations-Sprache', the Saṃmitīyas Prakrit, and the Sthaviras Apabhraṃśa. In all of these traditions there is some truth about the language practices of the different Buddhist *nikāya*s, for it was in part the use of a Sanskrit *vinaya* that distinguished the Mūlasarvāstivādins. But two major qualifications attach to these passages. First, there is a symmetrical logic at work, which associates the four major *nikāya*s not only with the four languages but (in the case of Padmākaraghoṣa) with four famous teachers and the four *varṇa*s. Second, the four languages themselves change, and significantly Paiśācī does not appear in the earlier traditions. The authors in question are evidently attempting to make sense of Buddhism's historical language practices with the concepts available to them, which are none other than the now-familiar concepts of the *bhāṣātraya* (or *-catuṣka*) that structured the cosmopolitan language order. This process of interpretation inevitably entails a reduction of complexity (as recent research on the languages of early Buddhism continues to demonstrate) and a high dose of anachronism (since the schism of the *nikāya*s predates the conceptualisation of Sanskrit, Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa as distinct and interrelated literary languages). More than anything else, the assignment of Paiśācī to the Sthaviras depends upon Paiśācī's admittance into the closed set of languages: for Śākyaprabha, like his contemporary Daṇḍin, Paiśācī is not a language; for Bu-ston, like his contemporary Jinapadmasūri, it is.

What both of these explanations have in common is that they connect Paiśācī with what we might call a 'pre-classical' tradition, whether it is Pali itself, or a hypothetical sister-language of Pali used by Buddhists in eastern India (von Hinüber) or by non-Buddhists (Master). Unless this tradition, in the guise of Pali, has been hiding under our noses the whole time—an unlikely scenario in my view—the most likely locus of this tradition is the *Bṛhatkathā*. The assumption of an *Ur-text* in the 'language of the ghosts', however, is problematic. Certainly there is a disjuncture between Paiśācī's status in a putative 'pre-classical' order, where it was the language of a major work of literature, and its status in a 'classical' order, where there was widespread disagreement, if not confusion, as to what exactly Paiśācī was and under what circumstances it could be employed.

It is precisely this gap between 'pre-classical' and 'classical' that might help us to understand the history of Paiśācī. Recall that Daṇḍin had used the word *bhūtabhāṣā*, for which Master had suggested the translation 'obsolete language'. Now consider that Uddyotanasūri, who refers to the *Bṛhatkathā* and who composes a short scene in Paiśācī, never says that Paiśācī was the language of the *Bṛhatkathā*. Is it possible that *bhūtabhāṣā* simply meant 'obsolete language' until

[105] The Tibetan and its translation follow Seyfort Ruegg, 'Über die Nikāyas der Śrāvakas', pp. 114–17.

Uddyotanasūri playfully decided to use this 'obsolete language' to represent the speeches of ghosts? Only after *bhūtabhāṣā* had been thus reinterpreted—from *bhūtā ca sā bhāṣā ca* to *bhūtānāṃ bhāṣā*—did it become possible to say that the *Bṛhatkathā* was composed in 'the language of the ghosts', that is, in Paiśācī. What was once a dead language became an undead language. It is noteworthy that the earliest so-called translations of the *Bṛhatkathā*, namely the *Vasudevahiṃḍī*, the *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṅgraha* and the *Peruṅkatai* (at least in the portions available to us), make no mention of Guṇāḍhya in the forest with the Piśācas. The 'story of the story' may have been devised to reconcile the older tradition that the *Bṛhatkathā* was composed in *bhūtabhāṣā* with the newer understanding of *bhūtabhāṣā* as Paiśācī, and prepended to the story of Udayana.

Interpreting *bhūtabhāṣā* in this way immediately allows us to make sense of its exclusion from the tripartite language order of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin: for these authors were theorists of a transregional literary culture that they themselves inhabited, and they sought to make sense out of the *contemporary* language practices of that culture. By the seventh century, Sanskrit, Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa were all widely recognised as the principal languages in which literature could be produced. And as we have seen, one of the conditions of the *Bṛhatkathā*'s reproduction in the 'classical' period was the use of one of these languages. *Bhūtabhāṣā*, by contrast, was a different kind of language *by definition*: a language of the literary past, which could be drawn upon and adapted, but in which no new works could ever be produced. If this interpretation is correct, it would provide further evidence for Sanskrit literary culture's sense of its own history.[106]

If *bhūtabhāṣā* did not belong to the synchronic picture of literary culture offered by 'classical' texts, why not? What made it a language of the past, in contrast to Sanskrit and Prakrit? Why, in other words, was it fixed at a certain point in time to which one could not return and from which one was constantly becoming farther away? Von Hinüber connects the problem to patronage: 'the attempt by Guṇāḍhya to establish this language in worldly literature ultimately failed, perhaps because no powerful dynasty was found in the east at Kauśāmbī to promote Paiśācī in the same way the Śātavāhanas established the Māhārāṣṭrī in the West'.[107] I would modify this statement very slightly. What the Sātavāhanas helped to establish was not just the use of Prakrit as a literary language, but the very era in literary culture that I have been calling 'classical'—the era that corresponds to Pollock's 'Sanskrit cosmopolis'. Around the first and second century there emerged a new and self-consciously literary form of discourse, namely *kāvya*, and an old–new set of languages to produce it in, namely Sanskrit and Prakrit. I say 'old–new' because Sanskrit and Prakrit already existed in some sense, but absolutely new was their mutual configuration as the linguistic parameters of a transregional

[106] For other examples of a 'sense of history' within the self-theorization of Sanskrit literary culture, see McCrea, 'Standards and Practices'.

[107] Von Hinüber, 'Pāli and Paiśācī', p. 72.

and non-denominational form of discourse. Patronage must have been essential to the establishment of Sanskrit and Prakrit as literary languages.

Concomitant with the rise of Sanskrit and Prakrit was the relative decline of a plethora of other 'pre-classical' languages. Most of these are called Prakrits in its broader signification, but if the above interpretation is right, a better term for them might be *bhūtabhāṣā*s: these might include, as von Hinüber suggests, many varieties of Buddhist Middle Indic (including Gāndhārī and Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit), but also varieties of Middle Indic for which we presently have no name. Several scholars have seen a close connection between the varieties of Paiśācī described by the grammarians and the language of the inscriptions of southern India around the first and second centuries CE. 'The Prākṛit used in [the] inscriptions of Amarāvatī betrays close affinity with the Paiśāchī Prākṛit of the grammarians.'[108] What Chandra was referring to here is not just the preservation of single intervocalic stops which are usually lenited in Prakrit (*bhagavato* instead of *bhaavao*), but the substitution of voiceless for voiced stops (*nāko* instead of *nāgo*). These 'Paiśācī-like' features of early inscriptions have not received any systematic study, to my knowledge, and they may ultimately be random blips on a spectrum of linguistic variation. My guess, which at the moment is only a guess, is that these features are associated with the Śakas, who migrated into India from central Asia in several waves beginning in the second century BCE. The Śakas had distinctive language practices, and 'Paiśācī-like' features appear in several inscriptions that are directly connected with them (for example, the word *bakini* rather than *bhaginī*).[109] Moreover, the composition of the *Bṛhatkathā* must be placed around the first or second century CE, which corresponds to the period in which the Śakas vied for cultural and political dominance with the Sātavāhanas. The obsolescence of this language, which was neither Sanskrit nor Prakrit, also corresponds to the political obsolescence of the Śakas, who were finally uprooted in the later fourth century by Candragupta II, remembered as the greatest patron of Sanskrit literary culture.

If we were to imagine a collection of stories about Udayana and Naravāhanadatta, compiled around the first century, we might guess that its language would be similar to Pali, on the one hand, and to the language of contemporary inscriptions (which Pischel called *leṇa*-Prakrit), on the other. This language was left behind by the 'Sanskrit cosmopolis', which regarded it as dead and gone (*bhūta*). But it lived on as a linguistic ghost, and was later brought back to life to serve as the language of inhuman ghouls, and thus as Paiśācī.

Appendix: Passages in Paiśācī

This list (generally in order of first appearance) builds upon the fragments collected and translated into French by Lacôte (*Essai*, pp. 201–06). The Sanskrit *chāyā* and

[108] Chandra, 'Some Unpublished Amaravati Inscriptions', p. 260.

[109] Vogel, 'Prakrit Inscriptions from a Buddhist Site at Nagarjunikonda', p. 37.

translation are my own unless otherwise noted. I have excluded from this appendix (*a*) one-word quotations from grammatical texts, which are often demonstrably fabricated by grammarians to exemplify their own rules; (*b*) Paiśācī passages in plays of the thirteenth century (*Hammīramadamardana* and *Moharājaparājaya*), which are extensive and merely instantiate Hemacandra's rules; and (*c*) those *stotra*s which I have not been able to consult (see p. 429).

A. Kuvalayamālā §139

For further reading see Master, 'An Unpublished Fragment of Paiśācī', and Kuiper, 'The Paiśācī Fragment of the Kuvalayamālā', both of which I consulted for the *chāyā* and translation. I have placed corrupt or extraneous portions of the Paiśācī text in angle brackets and omitted them from the *chāyā* and translation.

bhaṇiyam aṇṇeṇa pisāeṇa ṇiyaya-bhāsāe | *'bho etaṃ tae lappiyyate yathā tubbhehiṃ etaṃ pavvaya-natī-tīra-ramma-vana-kānanuyyāna-pura-nakara-pattana-sata-saṃkulaṃ puthavī-maṃḍalaṃ bhamamānakehiṃ kataro pateso ramaniyyo nirikkhito tti | etthaṃ kiṃ lapiyyaṃ | taṃ abhinavubbhinna-nava-cūta-maṃjarī-kusumotara-līna-<pavana-saṃcālita>-maṃdaṃmaṃdaṃdolamāna<m upāṃta>-pātapaṃtara<la>-sākhā-saṃghaṭṭa-vittāsita-chaccarana-ranaranāyamāna-tanutara-pakkha-saṃtati-vighaṭṭanuddhūta-vicaramāna-rajo-cunna-bhinna-hitapaka-vigalamāna-vimānita-māninī-sayaṃgāha-gahita-viyyāthara-ramano viyyātharopavanābhogo ramaniyyo*' tti |

(... bho, etat tvayā lapyate yathā yuṣmābhir etad parvata-nadī-tīra-ramya-vana-kānanodyāna-pura-nagara-pattana-śata-saṃkulaṃ pṛthvī-maṇḍalaṃ bhramamānaiḥ kataro pradeśo ramaṇīyo nirīkṣita iti | atra kiṃ lapyāmi? | tad abhinavojjhita-nava-cūta-mañjarī-kusumodara-līna-mandaṃmandāndolamāna-pādapāntara-śākhā-saṃghaṭṭa-vitrāsita-ṣaṭcaraṇa-raṇaraṇāyamāna-tanutara-pakṣa-saṃtati-vighaṭṭanoddhūta-vicaramāna-rajaś-cūrṇa-bhinna-hṛdaya-vigalamāna-vimānita-māninī-svayaṃgrāhagṛhīta-vidyādhara-ramano vidyādharopavanābhogo ramaṇīya iti)

One of the Piśācas said in his own language, 'Listen, you asked us, "which place did you find most pleasing as you wandered around the circle of the earth, with all of its hundreds of mountains, rivers, streams, pleasure groves, parks, gardens, forts, towns, and ports?" What should I say? The gardens of the vidyādharas are beautiful. There, the bees are constantly shooting out from inside the flowers of the clusters of mango-blossoms, frightened by the branches that rub against each other between the trees that are swaying in the breeze, and they shake out pollen from the constant beating of their tiny buzzing wings, and the pollen courses through the air and melts the hearts of women who forget their anger and take vidyādharas for lovers.'

aṇṇeṇa bhaṇiyaṃ | '*nahi nahi kāmacāra-vicaramāna-sura-kāminī-nigiyyamāna-daïya-gotta-kittanullasaṃta-romaṃca-seta-salila-pajjharaṃta-pātālaṃtaraka-rattuppala-citta-pithula-kanaka-silaṃtalo titasa-girivaro pavvata-rājo ramaniyyataro*' tti |

(... nahi nahi kāmacāra-vicaramāna-sura-kāminī-nigīyamāna-dayita-gotra-kīrtanollasad-romañca-sveda-salila-prakṣarat-pātālāntaraka-raktotpala-citra-pṛthula-kanaka-śilātalas tridaśa-giri-varaḥ parvata-rājo ramaṇīyatara iti)

Another said, 'No, no, more beautiful is Meru, King of the Mountains. It is the choice mountain of the thirty gods, where broad slabs of gold are studded with red lotuses, where the rivers of the underworld stream forth like the sweat that accompanies the mountain's exhilaration on hearing the divine damsels saying the names of their lovers over and over again as they roam free on its slopes.'

aṇṇeṇa bhaṇiyaṃ | '*kattham etaṃ lapitaṃ sulapitaṃ bhoti | vivitha-kappataru-latā-nibaddha-dolaka-samārūḍha-sura-siddha-viyyāthara-kaṃta-kāminī-janaṃdolamāna-gīta-ravākannana-sukha-nibbhara-pasutta-kanaka-mika-yugalako naṃdanavanābhogo ramaniyyataro*' tti |

(... katham idam lapitaṃ sulapitaṃ bhavati | vividha-kalpataru-latā-nibaddha-dolaka-samārūḍha-sura-siddha-vidyādhara-kānta-kāminī-janāndolamāna-gīta-ravākarṇana-sukha-nirbhara-prasupta-kanaka-mṛga-yugalako nandanavanābhogo ramaṇīyatara iti)

Another said, 'How can what you said be right? The grove of Nandana is more beautiful. In it, there are swings made by tying delicate vines to wishing-trees, and sitting on them are the girlfriends of the gods, siddhas, and vidyādharas, who sing songs as they swing which are so soothing to listen to that the pairs of golden deer nearby fall asleep.'

avareṇa bhaṇiyaṃ | '*yati na jānasi ramaniyyāramaniyyānaṃ visesaṃ, tā sunesu | uddāma-saṃcaraṃta-tinayana-vasabha-ḍhekkaṃtāravuppittha-bujjhaṃta-gorī-paṃcānana-rosa-vasa-vitinna-vikkama-nipāta-pātita-tuṃga-tuhina-sita-sisira-silā-sikharo himavaṃto ramaniyyatamo*' tti |

(... yadi na jānāsi ramaṇīyāramaṇiyānāṃ viśeṣam tato śṛṇu | uddāma-saṃcarat-triṇayana-vṛṣabha-ḍhakkad-ravottrasta-budhyamāna-gaurī-pañcānana-roṣa-vaśa-vitīrṇa-vikrama-nipāta-pātita-tuṅga-tuhina-sita-śiśira-śilā-śikharo himavān ramaṇīyatama iti)

Another said, 'If you don't know the difference between what's beautiful and what's not, then listen. The most beautiful is Mount Himālaya. There Śiva's bull wanders unrestrained, and its roaring bellow startles Gaurī from her sleep,

and Śiva, in his anger, is able to perform a feat of valor: making snow fall from on high, turning the mountain's peaks icy and white.'

aṇṇeṇa bhaṇiyaṃ | '*nahi nahi velā-taraṃga-raṃgaṃta-salila-lavoddhūta-sisira-māruta-vikiriyyamānelā-lavaṃka-kakkolaka-kusuma-bahala-makaraṃdāmutita-mathukara-kalakalārāvuggiyyamānekkekkama-pātapa-kusuma-bharo imo yyeva velā-vanābhogo ramaniyyatamo'* tti |

(... nahi nahi velā-taraṅga-raṅgat-salila-lavoddhūta-śiśira-māruta-vikrīyamānailā-lavaṅga-kakkolaka-kusuma-bahala-makaraṃdāmudita-madhukara-kalakalārāvodgīyamānānyonya-pādapa-kusuma-bharo ayam eva velā-vanābhogo ramaṇīyatama iti)

Another said, 'No, no, the most beautiful is this coastal forest right here: the waves beating on the shore fill the breezes with cool drops of water, and the breezes diffuse the intense nectar from flowers of cardamom, cloves, and *kakkolaka*, which delights the bees, who make it seem as if the clusters of blossoms in the trees are serenading each other with a gentle hum.'

avareṇa bhaṇiyaṃ | '*are, kiṃ imakehiṃ savvehiṃ yyeva rāmanīyaehiṃ | yaṃ parama-ramanīyakaṃ taṃ na ullapatha tubbhe | saggāvatāra-samanaṃtara-paticchita-nava-tibhāga-nayana-jaṭā-kalāpotara-nivāsa-sasi-kalā-niddhūtāmata-nivaha-mathura-dhavala-taraṃga-raṃgāvalī-vāhiniṃ pi bhagavatiṃ bhāgīrathiṃ ujjhitūna jammi pāpaka-sata-duṭṭhappasamo pi, kiṃ bahunā mitta-vatha-katāniṃ pi pātakāni sināna-mettakenaṃ yeva <sata-sakkarāni> panassaṃti | tā sa cceya ramanīyā suranati*' tti |

(... are, kiṃ ebhiḥ sarvebhir eva rāmaṇīyakaiḥ | yat parama-ramaṇīyaṃ tan na ullapata yūyam | svargāvatāra-samanantara-pratiśrita-nava-tribhāga-nayana-jaṭā-kalāpodara-nivāsa-śaśi-kalā-niddhūtāmṛta-nivaha-madhura-dhavala-taraṅga-raṅgāvalī-vāhinīm api bhagavatīṃ bhāgīrathīm ujjhitvā yasmin pāpa-śata-duṣṭa-praśamo 'pi, kiṃ bahunā mitra-vadha-kṛtāny api pātakāni snāna-mātreṇaiva … praṇaśyanti | tataḥ saiva ramaṇīyā suranadīti)

Another said, 'Alright, enough with all of these "beautiful" things. None of you mentioned the most beautiful thing of all. You forgot all about the divine Ganges. Right after her descent from heaven she found a place to stay within the dreadlocks of the three-eyed god, and there the digit of the moon illuminates the sweet white waves of nectar that she constantly streams forth, where even those defiled by hundreds of sins find tranquility. What more is there to say? Even the sins produced by killing a friend can be wiped out just by bathing in its waters (?). Thus the most beautiful of all is indeed the River of the Gods.'

tao savvehiṃ bhaṇiyaṃ | '*yadi evaṃ tā payaṭṭatha tahiṃ ceya vaccāmo*' tti bhaṇamāṇā uppaïyā dhoya-khagga-ṇimmalaṃ gayaṇayalaṃ pisāya tti

(... yadi evaṃ tato pravartasva tatraiva gacchāmaḥ...)

Then they all said, 'Well if that's so, then come on, let's go there.' And with these words all the Piśācas flew up into the sky, which was as white as a polished sword.

B. Kāvyālaṃkāra 4.13

Meter: *āryā*/*gāthā*. The verse can be read in Sanskrit and Paiśācī, with different meanings. The translation is based on Hahn, 'Der Bhāṣāśleṣa'; see also Master, 'The Mysterious Paiśācī', p. 218.

kamanekatamādānaṃ suratanarajatucchalaṃtadāsīnaṃ |
appatimānaṃkhamate soganikānaṃnaraṃjetuṃ ||

Sanskrit: You airhead, always thinking about sex, who is it that he'll be moved to defeat? Someone who takes as much as possible, someone who pretends to be just sitting there, someone as proud as the Lord of the Waters, someone who appears like Mount Mandara?

Paiśācī: He can't stand that those courtesans—whose meetings with their lovers *he* paid for, and whose servant-girls were always running after *his* costly jewels and silver—don't seem similarly excited to please him.

C. Kāvyālaṃkāra 4.19, Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa 2.8

Meter: *āryā*/*gāthā*. See also Master, 'The Mysterious Paiśācī', p. 218. The verse can be read in Sanskrit and Paiśācī, with the same meaning.

campakakalikākomalakāntikalāpātha dīpitānaṅgī |
icchati gajapatigamanā capalāyatalocanā lapitum ||

The whole of her beauty is as delicate as a *campaka* bud, and she burns even though she is bodiless: walking like an elephant, her eyes long and darting, she wants to speak.

D. Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa 2.164

Meter: *āryā*/*gāthā*. The verse can be read in Sanskrit and Paiśācī; the Sanskrit meaning praises Viṣṇu, and the Paiśācī meaning praises Śiva.

rucirañjitārihetiṃ jananamitaṃ sāmakāyamakalaṅkam |
santamamitaṃ ca mānaya kamalāsanamabhivirājantam ||

Sanskrit: O mother, bring him to me: the one who bathes his weapon in brilliant light, who is formed in each of his births, whose body is the Vedas, who

is not material, who is Brahma become Viṣṇu, who is atop Garuḍa and who is united with Lakṣmī.

Paiśācī: Worship the one who is brilliant, whose weapons conquer his enemies, whom the people bow to, whose body is dark but who is nevertheless spotless, who is reposed and infinite, who is luminous upon his lotus-throne.

E. Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa 2 ex. 4, Śṛṅgāraprakāśa 3 ex. 61, Siddhahemacandra ad 8.4.326, Gāthāmuktāvalī 13

Meter: *āryā*/*gāthā*. The verse is given in somewhat different forms in the sources listed above. I have selected the best readings, which are usually those of the GM (for which see Bhayani, 'Gāthā-muktāvalī'): *-tha* (like Prakrit: ŚP, SH) as the imperative ending, in accordance with the other passages quoted in this appendix (see F and G) instead of *-ta* (like Sanskrit: SKĀ, GM); *-ppakupita-* (GM) instead of *-pakuppita-* (*cett*.); *-golī-* (SH, SKĀ) instead of *-kolī-* (GM; the editor of ŚP puts both readings); *-paṭibiṃbaṃ* (GM) instead of *-patibiṃbaṃ* (a Sanskritising form: SH, ŚP) or *-paḍibiṃbam* (a Prakritising form: SKĀ); *tasasu*, *-tappanesuṃ*, *ekātasa-* and *-thalaṃ* (GM, SH, ŚP) instead of *dasasu*, *-dappanesuṃ*, *eādasa-* and *-dhalaṃ* (SKĀ); *luddaṃ* instead of *ruttaṃ* (which seems to be the editor's guess in the ŚP).

This verse is the *maṅgalācaraṇa* of the *Bṛhatkathā* according to Āsada's (Ājaḍa's) commentary on the *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* (Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, p. 855):

bṛhatkathāyām ādinamaskāro 'yam.
panamata panaya-ppakupita-golī-calanagga-lagga-paṭibiṃbaṃ |
dasasu nahadappanesu eādasatanudhalaṃ luddam ||

(pranamata praṇaya-prakupita-gaurī-caraṇāgra-lagna-pratibimbam |
daśasu nakha-darpaṇeṣu ekādaśa-tanu-dharaṃ rudram ||)

Reverence to Rudra who takes eleven forms:
he is reflected in the ten mirror-nails
as he lies at the feet of Gaurī
in the middle of one of their fights.

F. Śṛṅgāraprakāśa p. 1268

Prose. I have heavily emended the text as printed in Dvivedī's edition (where it is misattributed to the *Mahāvīracarita*) based on Raghavan, 'The Original Paiśācī Bṛhatkathā' and *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*. I note, however, that compared with the other extracts of Paiśācī given in this appendix, Raghavan's emended text remains quite 'Prakritised' (for example, *jadi* rather than *yati*). Bhoja introduces it as an example of *arthāpaharaṇa* and says that it occurs in the *kaliṅgasenālambha*, that is, the chapter (*lambha* = *lambaka*) dealing with Kaliṅgasenā, wife of

king Vikramāditya. Raghavan notes that the incident in question occurs in the *Viṣamaśīlalambaka* in the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* (where the gambler is named Ṭeṇṭākarāla) and the *Kathāsaritsāgara* (where he is named Ṭhiṇṭhākarāla).

> *bho geṃṭākarāla, payacchasu no vatthāni, jāni majjaṃtīnaṃ tue apahitāni | amhehiṃ sagge gaṃtavvaṃ | kathaṃ sināna-sāṭakesu parihitesu tattha vaccāmo? agacchamānīyo puno bhaāmo satakkatuno sāpāto pabhātāyaṃ ca savvarikāyaṃ silabbhūtā ihavve avaciṭṭhīsāmo* | ity apsarobhir ukte geṇṭākarālaḥ kaliṅgasenālambhe prāha—
>
> (bho geṇṭākarāla, prayaccha no vastrāṇi yāni majjantīnāṃ tvayā apahṛtāni | asmābhiḥ svarge gantavyam | kathaṃ snāna-śāṭakeṣu parihṛteṣu tatra gacchāmaḥ | agacchantyaḥ puno bibhimaḥ śakrakratoḥ śāpāt prabhātāyāṃ ca śarvarikāyāṃ śilābhūtāḥ ihaiva avasthāsyāmaḥ | ...)
>
> *payacchāmi vo vatthāni, jadi me ekkaṃ accharaṃ bhariaṃ saṃpayacchatha* |
> (prayacchāmi vo vastrāni yadi ekām apsarasam bhāryāṃ saṃprayacchatha |)
>
> 'Hey Geṇṭākarāla, give us back the clothes that you stole when we were bathing! We have to go back to heaven! How can we go there without the things we left in the cart? We're afraid that Indra will curse us if we don't return, and that we'll be turned to stone and have to stay here day and night.'
>
> 'I'll give you back your clothes if you give me an apsaras as a wife.'

G. Siddhahemacandra ad 8.4.326

Meter: *gīti*/*udgātha*.

> *naccantassa ya līlā-pātukkhevena kaṃpitā vasuthā |*
> *ucchallanti samuddā saïlā nipatanti taṃ halaṃ namatha ||*
>
> (nṛtyato ca līlā-pādotkṣepena kampitā vasudhā |
> ucchalanti samudrāḥ śailā nipatanti taṃ haraṃ namata ||)
>
> Worship Hara: when he gracefully lifts his foot up to dance,
> the earth shakes, the ocean swells, and the mountains topple over.

H. Siddhahemacandra ad 8.4.310–32

Prose. These short sentences, given as examples to Hemacandra's rules for Paiśācī, seem to belong to a single episode in which a king encounters a woman dressed as an ascetic. Lacôte (*Essai* p. 203) connected this episode with the story of Manorathaprabhā (as found in *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* 16.203*ff*. and *Kathāsaritsāgara* 10.3.81*ff*.), and Vijayalakshmy (*A Study of the Peruṅkatai*) with the episode in which Udayana encounters Viricikai in the forest in the *Peruṅkatai* (an episode not found in the other versions of the *Bṛhatkathā*). An important fragment is *rājaṃ cadāvaloka.* In his edition, Pischel emended this to *rājaṃ ca dāva loke*. Lacôte emended it *rājaṃ caṃḍāvaloka,* and connected the suffix *-avaloka* with the *birud*as

of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings; he conjectured that this passage must come not from Guṇāḍhya's original, but a Rāṣṭrakūṭa-period reworking of the *Bṛhatkathā*. Note that the style of this passage is very close to F.

kiṃ pi kiṃ pi hitapake atthaṃ ciṃtayamāni |

(kam api kam api hṛdaya arthaṃ cintayamānā |)

As she was going over various things in her mind...

pudhumataṃsane savvassa yyeva sammānaṃ kīrate |

(prathamadarśane sarvasyaiva saṃmānaṃ kriyate |)

Whenever you first meet someone, you need to be polite…

taṃ taṭṭhūna ciṃtitaṃ rañña kā esā huveyya |

(tāṃ dṛṣṭvā cintitaṃ rājña kaiṣā bhavet |)

When he saw her, the king thought, 'who could she be?'

tattha ca nena katasināne |

(tatra cānena kṛtasnānena |)

And when he had taken a bath there...

pūjito ca nāe pātagga-kusuma-ppatānena |

(pūjitaś cānayā pādāgra-kusuma-pradānena |)

She honored him by laying flowers down at his feet…

evaṃ ciṃtayaṃto gato so tāe samīpaṃ |

(evaṃ cintayan gato sa tasyāḥ samīpam |)

With that in mind, he went near her…

adha sasarīro bhagavaṃ makara-dhajo ettha paribbhamanto huveyya |

(atha saśarīro bhagavān makara-dhvaja atra paribhraman bhavet |)

Could it be the god of love in bodily form who is walking around here?

evaṃvidhāe bhagavatīe kadhaṃ tāpasa-vesa-gahanaṃ kataṃ |

(evaṃvidhayā bhagavatyā kathaṃ tāpasa-veśa-grahaṇaṃ kṛtam |)

How could a goddess like that put on the clothes of an ascetic?

etisaṃ atiṭṭhapuravaṃ mahādhanaṃ tatthūna |

(īdṛśam adṛṣṭapūrvaṃ mahādhanaṃ dṛṣṭvā |)

On seeing such a man, wealthier than any she had seen before…

bhagavaṃ yati maṃ varaṃ payacchasi |

(bhagavan yadi māṃ varaṃ prayacchasi |)

Lord, if you grant me a boon…

rājaṃ cadāvaloka |
(rājaṃś caṇḍāvaloka |)
O king, hard to look upon... *(see note above)*

tāva ca tīe tūrāto yyeva tiṭṭho so āgacchamāno rājā |
(tāvac ca tayā dūrata eva dṛṣṭaḥ sa āgacchan rājā |)
Just then she saw the king approaching from afar.

I. Kumārapālacarita 8.6–13

Meter: *āryā*/*gāthā*.

paññāna rāciñā guna-nidhinā raññā anañña-puññena |
cintetavvaṃ matanāti-verino kiḷa vijetavvā ||

(prājñānāṃ rājñā guṇa-nidhinā rājñā ananya-puṇyena |
cintayitavyaṃ madanādi-vairiṇaḥ kila vijayitavyaḥ ||)

suddhākasāya-hitapaka-jita-karana-kutumba-cesaṭo yogī |
mukka-kuṭumba-sineho na valati gantūna mukkha-pataṃ ||

(śuddhākaṣāya-hṛdaya-jita-karaṇa-kuṭumba-ceṣṭo yogī |
mukta-kuṭumba-snehaḥ na valate gatvā mokṣapadaṃ ||)

yanti kasāyā natthūna yanti naddhūna savva-kammāiṃ |
sama-salila-sinātānaṃ ujjhita-kata-kapaṭa-bhariyāna ||

(yānti kaṣāyā naṣṭvā yānti naṣṭvā sarva-karmāṇi |
śama-salila-snātānāṃ ujjhita-kṛta-kapaṭa-bhāryānām ||)

yati ariha-parama-manto paḍhiyyate kīrate na jīva-vadho |
yātisa-tātisa-jātī tato jano nivvutiṃ yāti ||

(yadi arhat-parama-mantraḥ paṭhyate kriyate na jīvavadhaḥ |
yādṛśa-tādṛsa-jātiḥ tato jano nirvṛtiṃ yāti ||)

acchati ranne sele vi acchate daḍha-tapaṃ tapanto vi |
tāva na labheyya mokkhaṃ yāva na visayāna tūrāto ||

(āste araṇye śaile ’pi āste dṛḍha-tapas tapyamāno ’pi |
tāvad na lapsyate mokṣaṃ yāvad na viṣayāṇāṃ dūrataḥ |)

tūrātu nena gheppati mutti-sirī nāi yoga-kiriyāe |
cattāri-maṅgalaṃ-pabhuti-mantam ukkhosamānena ||

(dūrato ’nena gṛhyate muktiśrīḥ anayā yoga-kriyayā |
catvāri-maṅgalaṃ-prabhṛti-mantram udghoṣamānena ||)

vanthū saṭhāsaṭhesu vi ālampita-upasamo anālampho |
savvaññā-lāca-calane anujjhāyanto havati yogī ||

(bandhuḥ śaṭhāśaṭheṣv api ālambitopaśama anārambhaḥ |
sarvajña-rāja-caraṇān anudhyāyan bhavati yogī ||)

jhacchara-ḍamaruka-bherī-ḍhakkā-jīmūta-gaphira-ghosā vi |
bamha-niyojitam appaṃ jassa na dolinti so dhaññho ||

(jhacchara-ḍamaruka-bherī-ḍhakkā-jīmūta-gambhīra-ghoṣā 'pi |
brahma-niyojitam ātmānaṃ yasya na dolayanti sa dhanyaḥ ||)

The king, a king among the wise, a treasury of virtue, of incomparable merit, must think: these enemies—passion and the rest—must be defeated. (6) A *yogin* who frustrates the efforts of all the senses with a pure and spotless heart, who is free of family ties, goes straight to liberation without coming back. (7) For those who bathe in the waters of quiescence, their sins vanish and go, their activities vanish and go, and they leave behind a widow in the form of their deeds. (8) If he recites the highest mantra of the Jains, if he refrains from killing living beings, then anyone at all can reach liberation. (9) Even if he stays in the forest, or in the mountains, practicing harsh austerities, a man will never obtain liberation until he is far from the senses. (10) But he can take hold of liberation from afar, by practicing *yoga* and by reciting the *catvāri-maṅgala* and the mantras of the *prabhṛti*. (11) A *yogin* who meditates on the feet of the omniscient king becomes a friend to the good and wicked alike, holds fast to tranquility, and does not engage in sinful action. (12) If the loud thundering sounds of jhaccharas, ḍamarukas, bherīs, and ḍhakkās (drums used in worship, AO) do not move his spirit from its attachment to brahma, then he is blessed. (13)

J. Dharmavardhana, Ṣaḍbhāṣānirmitapārśvajinastavana 6–7

Meter: *toṭaka* (6), unknown [3 *pañcamātra gaṇa*s + 1 *ra-gaṇa* per *pāda]* (7). Source: Schubring, 'Prakrit-Dichtung und Prakrit-Grammatik'. Schubring notes that *pāda* 7*d* does not fit with *pāda*s 7*a–c* (in sense as well as in meter).

tuha-tāha-tavānala-nāsa-ghanaṃ
subha-tāna-sukovita-gīta-gunaṃ |
dharanīsa-phanīsa-nataṃ satataṃ
nama pāsa-jinaṃ sa-suhaṃ mata-taṃ ||

(yuṣmad-dāha-tapānala-nāśa-ghanaṃ
śubha-tāna-sukovida-gīta-guṇaṃ |
dharanīśa-phaṇīśa-nataṃ satataṃ
nama pārśva-jinaṃ sa-sukhaṃ mada-daṃ ||)

matana-mata-sakhana-vana-dahana-khana-pāvakaṃ
siddha-supha-yuvati-siṅgāra-vara-jāyakaṃ |
yo hu tuha caḷana-jukã añjate saṃtataṃ
jakati savve janā pāsa-mataṃ anta-taṃ ||

(madana-mada-saghana-vana-dahana-kṣaṇa-pāvakaṃ
siddha-śubha-yuvati-śṛṅgāra-vara-jāyakaṃ |
yaḥ khalu tava caraṇa-yugaṃ añjate saṃtataṃ
jagati sarve janāḥ pārśva-mataṃ antadaṃ ||)

Joyfully bow to the conqueror Pārśva, the giver of delight: he is the cloud that extinguishes the wildfire of your suffering, whose qualities are sung by skilled singers in auspicious tones, to whom the lord of serpents Dharaṇīśa constantly bows. (6)

The one who constantly anoints your feet, which purify in an instant by burning up the vast forest of passion and pride, which overwhelms the lust of even the beautiful *siddha* women… everyone in the world (praises?) the liberating doctrine of Pārśva… (7)

K. Jinapadma, Ṣaḍbhāṣāvibhūṣitaśāntināthastavana 17–20

Meter: *vasantatilaka*. Source: Schubring, 'Prakrit-Dichtung und Prakrit-Grammatik'. The text is challenging; it is Prakritised at some points (*nādha* for *nātha*) and may be corrupt at others.

paññā-viḷāsa-satanaṃ matanaṃ hanantaṃ
lājīva-lāji-vatanaṃ ratanañjanaṃ taṃ |
puññaṃ variññā-guna-maṃhaḷa-puñña-tehaṃ
tevaṃ sasaṅka-vimaḷaṃ hitaye dhare 'haṃ ||

(prajñā-vilāsa-sadanaṃ madanaṃ ghnantaṃ
rājīva-rāji-vadanaṃ ratnāñjanaṃ tam |
puṇyaṃ vareṇya-guṇa-māṃsala-puṇya-dehaṃ
devaṃ śaśāṅka-vimalaṃ hṛdaye dhare 'ham ||)

saṃvega-mānasa-salovala-rājahaṃsaṃ
kitti-ppasatta-visatīkata-rāja-vaṃsaṃ |

tacchātisā visaya-turāvaturaṃga-caṅgaṃ
tatthūna ko dharati, nādha, paresu raṅgaṃ? ||

(saṃvega-mānasa-sarovara-rājahaṃsaṃ
kīrti-prasakta-viśadīkṛta-rāja-vaṃśaṃ |

tat-sādṛśyāt viṣaya-turāvaturaṃga-caṅgam (?)
dṛṣṭvā ko dharati nātha pareṣu raṅgam ||)

nimmāna, nimmama, nirīha, nisiddha-neha,
tevāhiteva, hata-tevana, teva-rāya, |
tevāhiteva-hata-tevana, tevarāya-
saṃghāta-sevita jayāhata-saṃparāya ||

(nirmāṇa nirmama nirīha niṣiddha-sneha
devādhideva hata-devana deva-rāja |

devādhideva-hata-devana deva-rāja-
saṃghāta-sevita jayāhata-saṃparāya ||)

ñāna-ppakāsita-jaga-ttitayantarāḷa,
saṃruddha-bhūkasaṭa, petuka-cāra-sāla, |
paññāḷa-tālaka, kutumba-yuto bhavāto
me tāranaṃ kuru sukorasa-koravāto! ||

(jñāna-prakāśita-jagat-tritayāntarāla
saṃruddha-bhū-kaṣṭa paitṛka-cāra-śāla
prajñāla-tāraka kuṭumba-yuto bhavān
me tāraṇaṃ kuru sugorasa-gauravān ||)

I carry in my heart the moon-white god who dwells in the play of insight, who destroys passion, whose face is like a bed of blue lotuses, the meritorious one, whose body is merit in material form of the highest quality. (17)

On seeing you, the royal goose in the lake Mānasa of confusion, you who have brightened the lineage of kings with your fame, you who are beautiful to all of the senses (?) because of your similarity to them—can anyone, Lord, take pleasure in anything else? (18)

Infinite, selfless, unperturbed, unattached, god above gods, victor over sorrow, king of the gods, who takes away the sorrow of the Arhats, worshipped by crowds of gods and kings, victor over death, victory to you! (19)

You who illuminate the three worlds and the space between with your insight, who put an end to the world's problems, the marker of the ancestral path, who save the wise, who are joined to your family, who have the whiteness of milk, bring me to the other side! (20)

L. Līlāvatīsāra 4.189–94

Meter: *āryā*/*gāthā*. There is a metrical problem in verse 192 (*kilālo*). The main text is in Sanskrit, but both the quotation and the immediately surrounding narration are in Paiśācī.

tata ekena lapitaṃ — *aye taṃ kattha gatosi* | bhanitam anena |
(… aye, tvaṃ kutra gato 'si | …)

tita-sapati-vinata-pata-yuga-sili-lisabha-jina-nami-jina-nati-nimittam |
aṭṭhāpata-pavvata-vala-bhalatesala-tittham agamam aham ||

(trita-sapadi-vinata-pada-yuga-śrī-ṛṣabha-jina-nami-jina-nati-nimittam |
aṣṭāpada-parvata-vara-bharateśvara-tīrtham agamam aham ||)

annena bhanitam *atha kiṃ tattha tae kim api tiṭṭham accharitaṃ* |
bhanitaṃ tenāpi *mayā sāvatthipule itaṃ tiṭṭhaṃ* ||

(… atha kiṃ tatra tvayā kim api dṛṣṭaṃ āścaryam |
… mayā śrāvastipure idaṃ dṛṣṭam ||)

bhīmo lāyā kenavi lāyapaṭam ahaṃ vunāmi bhanitūna |
upajīvitūna lakkhaṃ dīnāle nalapatī bhanito ||

(bhīmo rājā kenāpi rājapaṭam ahaṃ vṛṇomi bhaṇitvā |
upajīvitvā lakṣaṃ dīnārān narapatir bhaṇitaḥ ||)

etaṃ paṭaṃ hi picchati na jālajāto tato sa lājānaṃ |
naggaṃ kātūna pule sayale hiṃdāvitūna ca kilālo ||

(etaṃ paṭaṃ hi prekṣati na jārajātas tato sa rājānam |
nagnaṃ kṛtvā pure sakale hiṇḍāyitvā ca (?) ||)

naṭṭho munitaṃ taṃ lānaena mukkaṃ ca sādhanaṃ piṭṭhe |
tassa ya gavesanatthaṃ taṃ ca niyattaṃ tavena hataṃ ||

(naṣṭo jñātaṃ tad rāṇakena muktaṃ ca sādhanaṃ pṛṣṭhe |
tasya ca gaveṣaṇārthaṃ tat ca niyamitaṃ davena hatam ||)

so puna vāniyako ghola-alavi-majjhe kahiṃci palibhamadi |
tatto sa-hattha-tālaṃ hasitaṃ savva-ppisāehiṃ ||

(sa punar vānijako ghorāṭavi-madhye kutra cit paribhramati |
tato sa-hasta-tālaṃ hasitaṃ sarva-piśācaiḥ ||)

Then one of them said: 'Hey, where have you been?' He answered: 'I went to the *tīrtha* of Bharateśvara on the wonderful mount Kailāsa, which was established because of the reverence of the conqueror of Nami for the Jina Śrī Ṛṣabha, at whose feet the gods constantly bow.' The one said: 'So did you see anything interesting there?' He replied: 'I saw the following in the town of Śrāvasti. Someone told king Bhīma that he would make him a royal garment, and after receiving a hundred thousand gold coins upfront, he told the king that persons of illegitimate birth wouldn't be able to see it. Then he stripped the king naked and paraded him around the whole city, and disappeared. The king realised what had happened, and sent his army out behind to look for him, but they were stopped by a forest-fire. As for the merchant, he's wandering somewhere in this terrifying forest.' Then all of the Piśācas clapped their hands and laughed.

References

Abhinavagupta, *Abhinavabhāratī*: See Bharata.

Adaval, N. *The Story of King Udayana as Gleaned from Sanskrit, Pali and Prakrit Sources*, Varanasi, 1970.

Aiyavaraguna, S.P.V.R. 'Paiśācī Prakrit', *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. 48, November, 1919, pp. 211–13.

Alsdorf, L. 'The Vasudevahiṇḍi: A Specimen of Archaic Jaina-Māhārāṣṭrī', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, Vol. 8(2/3), 1936, pp. 319–33. Also in his *Kleine Schriften*, Albrecht Wezler, ed., Wiesbaden, 1974, pp. 56–70.

Bagchi, P.C. 'Sulika, Cūlikā, and Cūlikā-Paiśācī', *Journal of the Department of Letters (Calcutta)*, Vol. 21, 1931, pp. 1–10.

Banerjee, S. R. *The Eastern School of Prakrit Grammarians: A Linguistic Study*, Calcutta, 1960.

Bhāmaha, *Kāvyālaṅkāra*: C.S.R. Sastri, ed., *Kāvyālaṅkāra of Bhāmaha. Paricchhedas 1 to 6,* Madras, 1956.

Bharata, *Nāṭyaśāstra*: *The Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharatamuni. With the commentary Abhinavabhāratī by Abhinavaguptācārya,* Baroda. In 4 volumes: Vol. I (Chapters 1–7), 4th ed. by K. Krishnamoorthy, 1992; Vol. II (Chapters 8–18), 2nd ed. by V.M. Kulkarni and T. Nandi, 2001; Vol. III (Chapters 19–27), 2nd ed. by V.M. Kulkarni and T. Nandi, 2003; Vol. IV (Chapters 28–36), 2nd ed. by V.M. Kulkarni and T. Nandi, 2006.

Bhayani, H.C. 'Gāthā-muktāvalī: A newly-discovered recension of Hāla's Sapta-śataka', in *Indological Studies: Literary and Performing Arts, Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa Studies*, Ahmedabad, 1993, pp. 139–61.

Bhoja, *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*: R. Dwivedī, ed., *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa [Sāhityaprakāśa] by Bhojarāja,* New Delhi/ Varanasi, 2007.

———, *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa*: K. Śarmā and W.L. Śāstrī Paṇśīkar, eds, *The Saraswatī Kaṇṭhabharaṇa by Dhāreshvara Bhojadeva, with Commentaries of Rāmsinha (I–III) and Jagaddhara (IV),* Bombay, 1934, 2nd edition.

Bronner, Y. 'A Question of Priority: Revisiting the Bhāmaha-Daṇḍin Debate', *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. 40 (1), 2012, pp. 67–118. DOI 10.1007/s10781-011-9128-x.

Caṇḍa, *Prākṛtalakṣaṇa*: A.F.R. Hoernle, ed., *The Prákṛita-Lakshaṇam or Chaṇḍa's Grammar of the Ancient (Ársha) Prákṛit*, Calcutta, 1880.

Chandra, R. 'Some Unpublished Amaravati Inscriptions', *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. 15, 1919–20, pp. 258–75.

Daṇḍin, *Kāvyādarśa*: A. Thakur and U. Jha, eds, *Kāvyalakṣaṇa of Daṇḍin, also known as Kāvyādarśa, with Commentary Called Ratnaśrī of Ratnaśrījñāna*, Darbhanga, 1957.

Dhanañjaya, *Daśarūpaka*: K.P. Parab, ed., *Śrīdhanaṃjayaviracitaṃ Daśarūpakam, Dhanikakṛtayāvalokākhyayā Vyākhyayā Sametam*, Mumbaī, śāke 1819 [1897 CE].

Dhanapāla, *Tilakamañjarī*: B. Śāstrī and K.P. Parab, eds, *The Tilaka-Mañjarī of Dhanapāla*, Bombay, 1938.

Dillon, M., M. Fowler and V. Raghavan. 'The Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa of Sāgaranandin: A Thirteenth-century Treatise on the Hindu Theater', *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 50 (9), 1960, pp. 1–74.

Grierson, G. *The Piśāca Languages of North-Western India*, London, 1906.

———. 'Paiśācī, Piśācas, and "Modern Piśāca"', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Vol. 66, 1912, pp. 49–86.

———. 'The Bṛhatkathā in Mārkaṇḍeya', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, April, 1913, p. 391.

———. 'Rājaśekhara and the Home of Paiśācī', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, No. 3, 1921, pp. 424–28.

———. 'The Eastern School of Prakrit Grammarians and Paiśācī Prakrit', in *Sir Asutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Volumes*, *Vol. 3, Part 2*, Calcutta, 1925, pp. 119–41.

Hahn, M. 'Der Bhāṣāśleṣa—Eine Besonderheit kaschmirischer Dichter und Poetiker?' in Roland Steiner, ed., *Highland Philology: Results of a Text-Related Kashmir Panel at the 31st DOT, Marburg 2010*, Halle an der Saale, 2012, pp. 77–105.

Hemacandra, *Kumārapālacarita*: S. Pandurang Pandit and P.L. Vaidya, eds, *The Kumārapālacarita (Prākṛta Dvyāśraya Kāvya) of Hemachandra*, Poona, 1936.

Hemacandra, *Siddhahemacandra*: P.L. Vaidya, ed., *Prakrit Grammar of Hemacandra, Being the Eighth Chapter of his Siddhahemacandra,* Pune, 1928.

Jayasiṃhasūri, *Hammīramadamardana*: C.D. Dalal, ed., *Hammîra-mada-mardana of Jayasiṇha Śūri* [sic], Baroda, 1920.

Jinaratna, *Līlāvatīsāra*: H. C. Bhayani, ed., *Jinaratna's Līlāvatī-Sāra: A Sanskrit Abridgement of Jineśvara-Sūri's Prakrit Līlāvaī-Kahā,* Ahmedabad, 1983.

Kalhaṇa, *Rājataraṅgiṇī*: M.A. Stein, ed., *Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī: Chronicle of the Kings of Kashmir. Volume III: Sanskrit Text with Critical Notes*, Delhi, 1988 [1892].

Kālidāsa, *Meghadūta*: S.K. De, ed., *The Meghadūta of Kālidāsa,* New Delhi, 1970. 2nd edition.
Kane, P.V. *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, Delhi, 1987.
Keith, A.B. *A History of Sanskrit Literature*, Oxford, 1920.
Konow, S. 'Review of Bloch', *Vararuci und Hemacandra*, *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, Vol. 1, 1894, pp. 472–82.
———. *Rājaçekhara's Karpūramañjarī*, Cambridge, MA, 1901.
Konow, S. 'The Home of Paiśācī', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Vol. 64, 1910, pp. 95–118.
———. 'Rājaśekhara on the Home of Paiśācī', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Issue 2, 1921, pp. 244–46.
Kramadīśvara, *Saṃkṣiptasāra*: S.R. Banerjee, ed., *Prākṛtādhyāya (The Prākṛta Book of the Samkṣiptasāra)*, Ahmedabad, 1980.
Kuiper, F.B.J. 'The Paiśācī Fragment of the Kuvalayamālā', *Indo-Iranian Journal*, Vol. 1 (3), 1957, pp. 229–40.
Lacôte, F. *Essai sur Guṇāḍhya et la Bṛhatkathā, suivi du texte inédit des chapitres XXVII à XXX du Nepāla-māhātmya*, Paris, 1908.
Lassen, C. *Institutiones lingae pracriticae*, Bonn, 1837.
Leclère, B. 'Ambivalent Representations of Muslims in Medieval Indian Theatre', *Studies in History*, Vol. 27 (2), 2011, pp. 155–95.
Malamoud, C. 'On the Rhetoric and Semantics of Puruṣārtha', *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, Vol. 15 (1/2), 1981, pp. 33–48.
McCrea, L. 'Standards and Practices: Following, Making, and Breaking the Rules of a *Śāstra*', in Yigal Bronner, Whitney Cox, and Lawrence McCrea, eds, *South Asian Texts in History: Critical Engagements with Sheldon Pollock*, Ann Arbor, 2011, pp. 229–44.
Mārkaṇḍeya, *Prākṛtasarvasva*: K. C. Acharya (ed.), *Mārkaṇḍeya's Prākṛta-sarvasva*, Ahmedabad, 1968.
Master, A. 'The Mysterious Paiśācī', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. 1, 1943, pp. 34–45, 217–33.
———. 'An Unpublished Fragment of Paiśācī', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Vol. 12 (3/4), 1948, pp. 659–67.
Naikar, C.S. *The Prakrit Plays of India*, Dharwad, 1998.
Namisādhu: see Rudraṭa.
Narasimhachar, R. 'An Old Sanskrit Version of the Brhatkatha', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. 45(2), 1913, pp. 389–90.
Nelson, D. '*Bṛhatkathā* Studies: The Problem of an Ur-text', *The Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. 37(4), 1978, pp. 663–76.
Nitti-Dolci, L. (ed.), *Le Prākṛtānuśāsana de Puruṣottma*, Paris, 1938.
———. *The Prākrita Grammarians*, Delhi, 1972 [1938]. Translated by Prabhākara Jhā.
Pischel, R. *A Grammar of the Prākrit Languages*, Delhi, 1981 [1900]. Translated by S. Jhā.
Pollock, S. 'Rāmāyaṇa and Political Imagination in India', *The Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. 52(2), 1993, pp. 261–97.
———. *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men: Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Premodern India*, Berkeley, 2006.
———. 'From Rasa Seen to Rasa Heard', in Caterina Guenzi and Sylvia d'Intino, eds, *Aux bords de la clairière*, Paris, 2012, pp. 189–207.
Puruṣottama, *Prākṛtānuśāsana*: L. Nitti-Dolci, ed., *Le Prākṛtānuśāsana de Puruṣottama*, Paris, 1938.
Raghavan, V. 'The Original Paiśācī Bṛhatkathā', in *Bhārata Kaumudī: Studies in Honour of Dr Radha Kumud Mookerji*, Volume 2, Allahabad, 1947, pp. 575–88.
———. *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, Madras, 1963.
Rājaśekhara, *Kāvyamīmāṃsā*: C.D. Dalal and R.A. Shastry, eds, *Kāvyamīmāṁsā of Rājaśekhara,* Baroda, 1934, 3rd edition.

Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra, *Nāṭyadarpaṇa*: G. K. Shrigondekar and L.B. Gandhi, eds, *Nāṭyadarpaṇa of Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra with their own Commentary*, Baroda, 1929.

Ramanujaswami, P.V. 'Hemacandra and Paiśācī Prakrit', *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. 51, 1920, pp. 51–54.

Ratnaśrījñāna, *Ratnaśrīṭīkā*: See Daṇḍin.

Rudraṭa, *Kāvyālaṅkāra*: D. Dvivedi, ed., *Kāvyālaṅkāra of Rudraṭa with the Commentary of Namisādhu*, Bombay, 1886.

Salomon, R. *Ancient Buddhist Scrolls from Gandhāra*, London, 1999.

Sani, S. 'La Paiśācī, Lingua di Demoni', in Enrico Campanile, Romano Lazzeroni and Roberto Peroni, eds, *Scritti in Onore di Riccardo Ambrosini*, Pisa, 1985, pp. 193–204.

Śāradātanaya, *Bhāvaprakāśana*: Y. Yatiraja Swami and K.S. Ramaswami Sastri, eds, *Bhāvaprakāśana of Śāradātanaya*, Baroda, 1968.

Schubring, W. 'Prakrit-Dichtung und Prakrit-Grammatik', in Willibald Kirfel (ed.), *Beiträge zur Literatur-wissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte Indiens: Festgabe Hermann Jacobi zum 75. Geburtstag*, Bonn, 1926, pp. 89–97.

Seyfort Ruegg, D. 'Über die Nikāyas der Śrāvakas und den Ursprung der philosophischen Schulen des Buddhismus nach den Tibetischen Quellen', in Heinz Bechert, ed., *Zur Schulgehörigkeit von Werken derHīnayāna-Literatur*, Göttingen, 1985, pp. 111–26.

Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara*: Durgâprasâd and K.P. Parab, eds, *The Kathâsaritsâgara of Somadevabhatta,* Bombay, 1903, 2nd edition.

Tsuchida, R. 'Über die direkte Quelle für die kaschmirischen Versionen der Bṛhatkathā', *Indologica Taurinensia*, Vol. 28, 2002, pp. 211–50.

Uddyotanasūri, *Kuvalayamālā*: A.N. Upadhye, ed., *Uddyotana-sūri's Kuvalayamālā,* Bombay, 1959–70.

Upadhye, A.N. 'A Note on Trivikrama's Date', *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Institute,* Vol. 13 (2), 1931–32*a*, pp. 171–72.

———. 'Śubhacandra and his Prakrit Grammar', *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Institute,* Vol. 13 (1), 1931–32*b*, pp. 37–58.

———. 'Paiśācī Language and Literature', *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Institute*, Vol. 21 (1/2), 1939–40, pp. 1–37.

———. 'Prākrit Grammar Attributed to Samantabhadra', *Indian Historical Quarterly,* Vol. 17, 1941*a*, pp. 511–16.

———. 'Vālmīki-Sūtras, A Myth', *Bhāratīya Vidyā*, Vol. 2(2), 1941b, pp. 160–76.

Vāgbhaṭa, *Vāgbhaṭālaṅkāra*: Kedāranātha Śāstri and W.L. Śāstrī Paṇśīkar, eds, *The Vāgbhāṭālaṅkāra of Vāgbhaṭa with the Commentary of Simhadevagaṇi*, Bombay, 1933.

Vararuci, *Prākṛtaprakāśa*: E.B. Cowell, ed., *The Prákṛita-Prakáśa, or, the Prákṛit Grammar of Vararuchi, with the Commentary (Manoramá) of Bhámaha*, Hertford, 1854.

Vijayalakshmy, R. *A Study of the Peruṅkatai, an authentic version of the story of Udayana,* Madras, 1981.

———. 'The Tamil Peruṅkatai and its Relation to the Bṛhatkathā', *Indo-Iranian Journal*, Vol. 24 (1), 1982, pp. 27–36.

Viśvanātha, *Sāhityadarpaṇa*: P.V. Kane, ed, *The Sāhityadarpaṇa of Viśvanātha*, Bombay, 1923, 2nd edition.

Vogel, J.-Ph. 'Prakrit Inscriptions from a Buddhist Site at Nagarjunikonda', *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. 20, 1929–30, pp. 1–37.

von Hinüber, O. 'Die Paiśācī und die Entstehung der Sakischen Orthographie', in Klaus Bruhn and Albrecht Wezler, eds, *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus: Gedenkschrift für Ludwig Alsdorf*, Wiesbaden, 1981, pp. 121–27.

———. 'Pāli and Paiśācī as Variants of Buddhist Middle Indic', *Bulletin d'études indiennes*, Vol. 3, 1985, pp. 61–77.

Yāmuna, *Kāvyādarśavyākhyā*. MS. British Library OR 9340.

Yaśaḥpāla, *Moharājaparājaya*: Chaturavijayaji and C.D. Dalal, eds., *Moharâjaparâjaya of Yasahpala*, Baroda, 1918.

Yuyama, A. 'Bu-Ston on the Languages Used by Indian Buddhists at the Schismatic Period', in Heinz Bechert, ed., *Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung/The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition*, Göttingen, 1980, pp. 175–81.

Zin, M. 'The Oldest Painting of the Udayana Legend', *Berlin Indologische Studien*, Vol. 11/12, 1998, pp. 435–48.